DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 583 CE 051 659

TITLE Hearing on H.R. 18, American Conservation Corps Act of 1987. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, First Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 21 May 87

NOTE 111p.; Serial No. 100-24. Document contains some small type.

AVAILABLE FROM Congressional Sales Office, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Conservation (Environment); Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Hearings; Minority Groups; *On the Job Training; Secondary Education; Unemployment; Young Adults; *Youth Employment; Youth Opportunities; *Youth Programs

IDENTIFIERS Congress 100th; Proposed Legislation

ABSTRACT

This document contains testimony from a congressional hearing on a bill to create the American Conservation Corps. Its focus is the need for this direct federal program for young people that would combine both full-time employment and an opportunity for education and on-the-job training. Testimony includes statements, prepared statements, letters, and supplemental materials from U.S. representatives and senators and from individuals representing Public/Private Ventures, Inc.; National Association of Service and Conservation Corps; Wisconsin Conservation Corps; Shell Oil Corp.; Texas Conservation Corps; National Recreation and Park Association; Human Environment Centers; East Bay Conservation Corps., Oakland, California; National Congress of American Indians; and the National Youth Leadership Council. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303583

HEARING ON H.R. 18, AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1987

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, ON MAY 21, 1987

Serial No. 100-24

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED351659

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
76-011 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM P. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California, *Chairman*

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, DC, on May 21, 1987 1
Text of H.R. 18 69
Statement of:
Bailin, Michael, president, Public/Private Ventures, Inc 58
Basl, William, president, National Association of Service and Conservation Corps 46
Fremstad, Debra K., Trempealeau County, WI, corps member in the Wisconsin Conservation Corps 29
Petty, Frank, senior representative, Shell Oil Corp., and chairman, Texas Conservation Corps 17
Sikorski, Hon. Gerry, a U.S. Representative from the State of Minnesota 12
Simon, Hon. Paul, a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois 1
Tindall, Barry, director of public affairs, National Recreation and Park Association 33
Yzaguirre, Raul, president, National Council of La Raza, representing the Human Environment Centers, accompanied by Joanna Lennon, executive director, East Bay Conservation Corps, Oakland CA 40
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:
Bailin, Michael A., president, Public/Private Ventures, Inc., prepared statement of 61
Basl, William C., president, National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, prepared statement of 49
California Conservation Corps, Santa Clara Center, letter in support of a National Conservation Corps 106
Fremstad, Debra K., Wisconsin Conservation Corps, prepared statement of 31
Moynihan, Hon. Daniel Patrick, a U.S. Senator from the State of New York, prepared statement of 102
National Congress of American Indians, letter in support of H.R. 18 105
National Youth Leadership Council, statement of 107
Panetta, Hon. Leon E., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, prepared statement of 98
Petty, Frank E., chairman, Texas Conservation Corps, prepared statement of 20
Sikorski, Hon. Gerry, a Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota, prepared statement of 15
Simon, Hon. Paul, a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois, prepared statement of 5
Tindall, Barry S., director of public affairs, National Recreation and Park Association, prepared statement of 37
Yzaguirre, Raul, Human Environment Center, prepared statement of 42

HEARING ON H.R. 18, AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1987

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1987

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:15 a.m., in room 304, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Matthew G. Martinez (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Martinez, Jontz, Gunderson and Grandy.

Staff present: Eric Jensen, staff director; Bruce Packard, legislative assistant; Mary Gardner, minority staff member, and Tammy Harris, clerk.

Mr. MARTINEZ. The subcommittee will come to order.

The subcommittee meets today to hear testimony on H.R. 18, the American Conservation Corps Act of 1987. This bill was introduced by our good friend and colleague, Mr. Udall, with co-sponsorship by Mr. Vento, Mr. Kildee and me.

We will hear testimony on this bill from two panels today. The first panel consists of the Honorable Paul Simon, the distinguished Senator from Illinois; Congressman Gerry Sikorski from Minnesota, and Mr. Frank Petty, Vice President of Shell Oil Corporation, who will be speaking to us in his capacity as Chairman of the Texas Conservation Corps. We had another witness for the first panel, our esteemed colleague Congressman Silvio Conte from Massachusetts, but we have been informed that he will not be able to be with us because of other commitments.

Senator Simon, it is a pleasure to welcome you before this subcommittee. We look forward to hearing your testimony. Your prepared statement will be made a part of the record, and you may proceed in any manner you desire.

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL SIMON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Senator SIMON. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I am both delighted and disappointed to appear before you today in support of the American Conservation Corps; delighted because I know this is a good program, and disappointed because this bill was not enacted in the 99th Congress.

The American Conservation Corps would be the only direct Federal program for our young people that would combine both full-

time employment and an opportunity for education and on-the-job training. It addresses the serious and chronic problem of youth unemployment, which is much too high, especially for minorities. Our message to today's youth seems to be that they are not needed. We seem to forget that today's youth determine the quality and character of tomorrow. But this Nation has turned its back on our young people. Funding for education has been cut back, violence on TV is a pernicious problem, and this country has made little real effort to put America's youth to work. No wonder high school dropout rates are so high and teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, and youth crime are increasing.

The American Conservation Corps will help us address these problems and give our young people the opportunity to prove to America that they can contribute to our society. When President Franklin Delano Roosevelt launched the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933 he said,

> More important than material gains will be the moral and spiritual value of such work. We can take a vast army of these unemployed out into healthful surroundings. We can eliminate, at least to some extent, the threat that enforced idleness brings to moral and spiritual stability.

Idleness is a critical problem today among youth, and we must attack it with the same urgency and insight that FDR used over 50 years ago when he created the American Conservation Corps. Those crews of spirited CCC enrollees working across the country in the 1930's helped convince millions of despairing Americans that a better future could come. That program was a good idea then, and the American Conservation Corps is a good idea now.

As the late and remembered Senator Hubert Humphrey noted, "The CCC left no bad taste. Even the bitterest opponent of the New Deal has to admit that the CCC was a sound investment in both people and land."

My own State of Illinois established a conservation corps last year. Dan Petrilli, director of the Illinois program, reports that "we've not even scratched the surface" in fulfilling the work that needs to be done, or in hiring the unemployed youth who are available for work in Illinois. The sponsors of the work projects often say that the corps' projects needed to be done five to ten years earlier. At its current size, the program can't keep up with the backlog of work that needs to be done in the State parks alone. In fact, Mr. Petrilli reports that we could keep those young people busy for another three years without adding one single new project.

The program in Illinois doesn't begin to meet the needs of employment of our young people. There are about 170,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 24 who are out of work in Illinois alone. The State Conservation Corps can only provide 150 jobs for those young people on a year-round basis, and only 600 jobs in the summer. Is there any question that the American Conservation Corps is needed on a national scale?

Illinois is not the only State that has demonstrated the need for a Federal program. As you can see from the displays around this room and the Corps members present in the audience, other States and local communities have similar programs. I am told that all together, these State and local programs fill 20,000 jobs a year; yet, 2.9 million young people between the ages of 16 and 24 are unem-

ployed across the Nation. These State and local programs are struggling to meet up with the demand, and it's time they had a Federal partner.

The State programs work well, and they are cost-effective. According to the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, the Youth Conservation Corps and the Young Adult Conservation Corps programs of the 1970's returned $1.04 and $1.20 respectively in conservation work for every $1.00 expended by the Federal Government. In Illinois, these figures are even higher; in the year-round program, the return is almost $4.00 for every $1.00 spent, and $2.00 for every $1.00 spent in the summer program. These figures prove that President Reagan was wrong in his veto message of the ACC bill in 1984. He said the programs have proven to be costly and ineffective, and that their approach to youth unemployment has been discredited. This is clearly not true. I am sure that if the President had been aware of these facts in 1984, we would have an American Conservation Corps on the books today, and countless thousands of young people would be working instead of standing on street corners and hanging out in shopping centers, looking for something to do.

The Senate made some changes in the ACC bill in the 99th Congress that are incorporated in the version that was introduced in this session. Those changes increase the level of participation for the States and thereby stretch the modest $75 million appropriation that is asked for in this bill. I think that these changes strengthen the bill and are in keeping with the need for Federal, State and local partnerships in creating employment opportunities.

The deficit does not alter the Nation's interest in putting unemployed youth to work on high-priority conservation programs. This program will save the Government money and permit young people to reach their fullest opportunity. It will revive a work ethic among our young people and it will bring back a means for education through work experience. It will open doors for the many trapped among the staggering masses of the unemployed.

Converting our underskilled and undereducated youth into employable and proud members of a contributing society is a worthwhile goal. We cannot go wrong if we can achieve that goal while simultaneously remedying the deterioration of our natural lands, parks and recreation facilities. In this manner, our youth can serve both our heritage and our future.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be here today and to endorse this noble concept. The work is there to be done, and the youth are there to do it. Put the two together and America has a winner. The American Conservation Corps is an investment with high returns for our young people, for our precious natural resources, and for our entire country.

I was interested recently in some international economic data that indicated that the average worker in Japan is making five percent as much as the average worker in the United States. How does Japan do it? Japan has invested in her people. We are investing, candidly, too much in missiles, in things that do not have the kind of long-term payoff that Japan has provided for her people.

Now, we have to have an adequate defense, but I think we have to recognize that security in this country is more than simply a collection of weapons.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Paul Simon follows:]

TESTIMONY OF

SENATOR PAUL SIMON

IN SUPPORT OF

THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT(H.R. 38 AND S. 273

BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

MAY 21,1987

GOOD MORNING MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE. I AM BOTH DELIGHTED AND DISAPPOINTED TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY IN SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS. DELIGHTED, BECAUSE I KNOW THIS IS A GOOD PROGRAM. DISAPPOINTED, BECAUSE THIS BILL WAS NOT ENACTED IN THE 99TH CONGRESS.

THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS WOULD BE THE ONLY DIRECT FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR OUR YOUNG PEOPLE THAT WOULD COMBINE BOTH FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AND AN OPPORTUNITY FOR EDUCATION AND ON-THE-JOB TRAINING. IT ADDRESSES THE SERIOUS AND CHRONIC PROBLEM OF YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT , WHICH IS MUCH TOO HIGH, ESPECIALLY FOR MINORITIES. OUR MESSAGE TO TODAY'S YOUTH SEEMS TO BE THAT THEY ARE NOT NEEDED. WE SEEM TO FORGET THAT TODAY'S YOUTH DETERMINE THE QUALITY AND CHARACTER OF TOMORROW. BUT, THIS NATION HAS TURNED ITS BACK ON OUR YOUNG PEOPLE. FUNDING FOR EDUCATION HAS BEEN CUT BACK, VIOLENCE ON TV IS A PERNICIOUS PROBLEM, AND THIS COUNTRY HAS MADE LITTLE REAL EFFORT TO PUT AMERICA'S YOUTH TO WORK. NO WONDER HIGH SCHOOL DROP-OUT RATES ARE SO HIGH AND TEENAGE PREGNANCY, DRUG ABUSE, AND YOUTH CRIME ARE INCREASING.

THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS WILL HELP US ADDRESS THESE PROBLEMS AND GIVE OUR YOUNG PEOPLE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVE TO AMERICA THAT THEY CAN CONTRIBUTE TO OUR SOCIETY. WHEN PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT LAUNCHED THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS IN 1933, HE SAID:

> MORE IMPORTANT...THAN MATERIAL GAINS WILL BE THE MORAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUE OF SUCH WORK...[W]E CAN TAKE A VAST ARMY OF THESE UNEMPLOYED OUT INTO HEALTHFUL SURROUNDINGS...[W]E CAN ELIMINATE, AT LEAST TO SOME EXTENT, THE THREAT THAT ENFORCED IDLENESS BRINGS TO MORAL AND SPIRITUAL STABILITY.

IDLENESS IS A CRITICAL PROBLEM TODAY AMONG YOUTH AND WE MUST ATTACK IT WITH THE SAME URGENCY AND INSIGHT THAT FDR USED OVER 50 YEARS AGO WHEN HE CREATED THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS. THOSE CREWS OF SPIRITED CCC ENROLLEES WORKING ACROSS THE COUNTRY IN THE 30'S HELPED CONVINCE MILLIONS OF DESPAIRING AMERICANS THAT A BETTER FUTURE COULD COME. THAT PROGRAM WAS A GOOD IDEA THEN, AND THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS IS A GOOD IDEA NOW.

AS THE LATE AND REMEMBERED SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY NOTED,"THE CCC LEFT NO BAD TASTE. EVEN THE BITTEREST OPPONENT OF THE NEW DEAL HAS TO ADMIT THAT THE CCC WAS A SOUND INVESTMENT IN BOTH PEOPLE AND LAND."

MY OWN STATE OF ILLINOIS ESTABLISHED A CONSERVATION CORPS LAST YEAR. DAN PETRILLI, DIRECTOR OF THE ILLINOIS PROGRAM, REPORTS THAT "WE'VE NOT EVEN SCRATCHED THE SURFACE" IN FULFILLING THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE, OR IN HIRING THE UNEMPLOYED YOUTH WHO ARE AVAILABLE FOR WORK IN ILLINOIS. THE SPONSORS OF THE WORK PROJECTS OFTEN SAY THAT THE CORPS' PROJECTS NEEDED TO BE DONE FIVE TO TEN YEARS EARLIER. AT ITS CURRENT SIZE, THE PROGRAM CAN'T KEEP UP WITH THE BACKLOG OF WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE IN THE STATE PARKS ALONE. IN FACT, MR. PETRILLI REPORTS THAT WE COULD KEEP THOSE YOUNG PEOPLE BUSY FOR ANOTHER THREE YEARS WITHOUT ADDING ONE SINGLE NEW PROJECT.

THE PROGRAM IN ILLINOIS DOESN'T BEGIN TO MEET THE NEEDS OF EMPLOYMENT OF OUR YOUNG PEOPLE. THERE ARE ABOUT 170,000 YOUNG PEOPLE BETWEEN THE AGES OF 16 AND 24 WHO ARE OUT OF WORK IN ILLINOIS ALONE. THE STATE CONSERVATION CORPS CAN ONLY PROVIDE 150 JOBS FOR THOSE YOUNG PEOPLE ON A YEAR-ROUND BASIS, AND ONLY 800 JOBS IN THE SUMMER. IS THERE ANY QUESTION THAT THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS IS NEEDED ON A NATIONAL SCALE?

ILLINOIS IS NOT THE ONLY STATE THAT HAS DEMONSTRATED THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL PROGRAM. AS YOU CAN SEE FROM THE DISPLAYS AROUND THIS ROOM AND THE CORPS MEMBERS PRESENT IN THE AUDIENCE, OTHER STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES HAVE SIMILAR PROGRAMS. I AM TOLD THAT ALL TOGETHER THESE STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS FILL 20,000 JOBS A YEAR. YET, 2.9 MILLION YOUNG PEOPLE BETWEEN THE AGES OF 16 AND 24 ARE UNEMPLOYED ACROSS THE NATION. THESE STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS ARE STRUGGLING TO MEET UP WITH THE DEMAND, AND IT'S TIME THEY HAD A FEDERAL PARTNER.

THE STATE PROGRAMS WORK WELL, AND THEY ARE COST EFFECTIVE. ACCORDING TO THE DEPARTMENTS OF INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE, THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND THE YOUNG ADULT CONSERVATION CORPS PROGRAMS OF THE 1970'S RETURNED $1.04 AND $1.20 RESPECTIVELY IN CONSERVATION WORK FOR EVERY $1.00 EXPENDED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IN ILLINOIS, THESE FIGURES ARE EVEN HIGHER--IN THE YEAR-ROUND PROGRAM THE RETURN IS ALMOST $4.00 FOR EVERY $1.00 SPENT, AND $2.00 FOR EVERY $1.00 SPENT IN THE SUMMER PROGRAM. THESE FIGURES PROVE THAT PRESIDENT REAGAN WAS WRONG IN HIS VETO MESSAGE OF THE ACC BILL IN 1984. HE SAID THE PROGRAMS HAVE PROVEN TO BE COSTLY AND INEFFECTIVE, AND THAT THEIR APPROACH TO YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT HAS BEEN DISCREDITED. THIS IS CLEARLY NOT TRUE. I AM SURE THAT IF THE PRESIDENT HAD BEEN AWARE OF THESE FACTS IN 1984, WE WOULD HAVE AN AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ON THE BOOKS TODAY, AND COUNTLESS THOUSANDS OF YOUNG PEOPLE WOULD BE WORKING INSTEAD OF STANDING ON STREET CORNERS AND HANGING OUT IN SHOPPING CENTERS LOOKING FOR SOMETHING TO DO.

THE SENATE MADE SOME CHANGES IN THE ACC BILL IN THE 99TH CONGRESS THAT ARE INCORPORATED IN THE VERSION THAT WAS INTRODUCED IN THIS SESSION. THOSE CHANGES INCREASE THE LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION FOR THE STATES AND THEREBY STRETCHES THE MODEST $75 MILLION APPROPRIATION THAT IS ASKED FOR IN THIS BILL. I THINK THAT THESE CHANGES STRENGTHEN THE BILL AND ARE IN KEEPING WITH THE NEED FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS IN CREATING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

THE DEFICIT DOES NOT ALTER THE NATION'S INTEREST IN PUTTING UNEMPLOYED YOUTH TO WORK ON HIGH PRIORITY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS. THIS PROGRAM WILL SAVE THE GOVERNMENT MONEY AND PERMIT YOUNG PEOPLE TO REACH THEIR FULLEST OPPORTUNITY. IT WILL REVIVE A WORK ETHIC AMONG OUR YOUNG PEOPLE AND IT WILL BRING BACK A MEANS FOR EDUCATION THROUGH WORK EXPERIENCE. IT WILL OPEN DOORS FOR THE MANY TRAPPED AMONG THE STAGGERING MASSES OF THE UNEMPLOYED.

CONVERTING OUR UNDERSKILLED AND UNDEREDUCATED YOUTH INTO EMPLOYABLE AND PROUD MEMBERS OF A CONTRIBUTING SOCIETY IS A WORTHWHILE GOAL. WE CANNOT GO WRONG IF WE CAN ACHIEVE THAT GOAL WHILE SIMULTANEOUSLY REMEDYING THE DETERIORATION OF OUR NATURAL LANDS, PARKS, AND RECREATION FACILITIES. IN THIS MANNER, OUR YOUTH CAN SERVE BOTH OUR HERITAGE AND OUR FUTURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM PROUD TO BE HERE TODAY AND TO ENDORSE THIS NOBLE CONCEPT. THE WORK IS THERE TO BE DONE, AND THE YOUTH ARE THERE TO DO IT. PUT THE TWO TOGETHER AND AMERICA HAS A WINNER. THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS IS AN INVESTMENT WITH HIGH RETURNS FOR OUR YOUNG PEOPLE, FOR OUR PRECIOUS NATURAL RESOURCES, AND FOR OUR ENTIRE COUNTRY.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Grandy?

Mr. GRANDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Simon, I'm sure that you've discovered in your travels around my State, and possibly your State, too—one problem that we have in Iowa right now with our youth is, how do we offer opportunities so they are able to remain in Iowa. The declining farm economy has displaced so many young people and their families simultaneously. A lot of kids are leaving not just because there aren't jobs on the farm, but because there aren't jobs in the local hospitals, there aren't jobs in the local factories. They're leaving and they're not coming back. And without that talent reserve, we are suffering a severe intellectual—as well as an economic—decline.

My concern about this legislation is, do you see this as a way to retain that talent in a State like Iowa, which is undergoing a certain upheaval, a certain metamorphosis? I'm not exactly sure what it will look like when the economy finally rights itself. But I must say that as I look for opportunities, I look for opportunities that will keep people in the State for a longer period of time. We have a tremendous problem with kids that are losing Pell grants right now that can no longer afford to go to our State's independent colleges. We have been an excellent network of colleges. Now they're beginning to lose their franchise because the kids aren't going. They're leaving even before they go to school.

How could you make this program a little bit more attractive to that youth force? You said that a makework job is better than none, and I suppose that's true. But I am more interested in the "make career" kind of job. How do we address that in this legislation as opposed to, perhaps, diverting dollars into programs that will train these kids for health care positions or agribusiness positions or investment in career opportunities that might oblige them to stay in the State for a longer period of time?

Senator SIMON. Okay. I guess—I don't think you can look at this legislation as the answer to that problem. Nor, frankly, are the other things that you just talked about going to be answered by that. You can train people for agribusiness, but if you don't have the agribusiness they're going to go somewhere else.

And I would just add, we compound the problems of the cities, of Des Moines, of Chicago, of Indianapolis, of Minneapolis when you don't have opportunities in Storm Lake, Iowa. What we have to do is—and I think it is totally separate from this—but I think we have to obviously get the farm economy moving, but I think second, we need to have a UDAG program that really is designed for small-town America and for areas that are hard-hit, like much of Iowa is hard-hit. I think it can be done. I think Iowa is going to be better off when we do it, and the Nation will. But I don't see this legislation as, frankly, meeting that particular problem. It is a very real problem; there's just no question about it, and I commend you for taking an interest in the problem.

Mr. GRANDY. Do you think, then, just to follow up, there is a possibility—that a State like Iowa, not perhaps as great a conservation potential as a State like Minnesota, be in a position where it might be helping to pay for a program that it was not using proportion-

ately? That's another thing I'm concerned about. I'm also thinking that perhaps this would force an exodus of kids out of the State to go into a conservation program as an opportunity in some other State. Do you see this as something that is designed and tailored at the State level? So, for example, in Iowa these kids might be working in the Conservation Reserve Program as, perhaps, stewards of conservation reserve acres?

Senator SIMON. I am not that familiar with the legislation, but I would think there are all kinds of opportunities there in Iowa to put people to work within your State. And Gerry Sikorski has just handed me a note saying that Iowa has a program that would receive funding under this program.

There is no question but that all kinds of things need to be done. I have just finished taking a look at a study about why we're having flooding around this Nation. Do you know one of the reasons we're having flooding around this Nation? It ought to be fairly obvious. We're taking out trees and putting in parking lots and shopping centers and houses and planting more soybeans, so we're just not absorbing that water. You could be planting in Iowa along with the rest of the Nation, millions of trees, improving our air quality, reducing flooding costs in the future. But there is no question in my mind. I've been around Iowa enough to know that you have some areas with great potential for exactly this kind of work. I think this program can apply to Iowa and help Iowa.

Mr. GRANDY. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Senator.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Grandy.

Yes, Gerry?

Mr. SIKORSKI. If I could just follow up, the bill handles that kind of situation. There are a whole host of things. It's not just in the woods, in the mountains, in the lakes. It's wetlands, pollution control, insect disease, rodents, fire protection, abandoned railway bed and right-of way programs, energy conservation projects, reclamation, erosion, flood, drought, storm damage, road and trail maintenance, fish culture, urban revitalization, historical and cultural site preservation, and then you get into the conservation, the rangelands, the forest lands, and the rest of it. So it's pretty broad. And it also triggers State and local organizations and nonprofit organizations, all of which are in abundance in Iowa and other States, that you wouldn't normally think of in connection with a conservation corps.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Simon?

Senator SIMON. I thank whoever handed me this. Among other things, on page 10 it talks about "proximity of facilities" to those who are working, and among other things, on lines 23 and 24 it says, "Every effort shall be made to assign youths to facilities as near to their homes as practicable." So I think that problem has been addressed.

Let me thank you again, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. It's good to be over here again.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Well, let me thank you, Senator Simon, for taking the time from your busy schedule to be with us. We appreciate it deeply. Thank you.

Before I turn to Congressman Sikorski let me just add one little word.

H.R. 18 also includes recreational facilities, and I believe Iowa has a number of historical sites, also. It also includes historical sites and their preservation. I think we really have to remember the depth and width of the legislation and how it can pertain to your particular instance. But even if it didn't cover one single place in Iowa, that is still no reason not to support it because it really is of benefit to the United States overall. We may be Representatives of one particular area, but we're also Representatives of all the American people.

Mr. Sikorski?

STATEMENT OF HON. GERRY SIKORSKI, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. SIKORSKI. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to appear in strong support of Mo Udall's American Conservation Corps Act, H.R. 18. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill because it's an important step in improving America's natural resources, training America's youth, and developing a new American spirit of citizenship. It is consistent with the greater ideal of national service, which our country sorely needs today.

Let me just point out today that the subcommittee is meeting 60 years to the day, May 21st, 1927, when a young American who hailed from Minnesota stood in the dark night hours on the soil of France, completing the first solo trans-Atlantic flight, a new American hero and a fine example of what young Americans can do if we give them a chance.

The American Conservation Corps celebrates that spirit and America's new young patriots. It encourages America's young people to reject the corruption seen at the basement of the White House, at a Washington town house, on Wall Street, in the pulpits, and become involved in their communities, soar to new heights, protect our environment, and develop the collective spirit of patriotism.

A smaller version of the American Conservation Corps exists in my own State of Minnesota, and it is highly successful. Across the Nation there are now some 40 State and local conservation corps, created in the last few years. These and other youth service programs are exploding with success.

The American Conservation Corps is modeled after the Civilian Conservation Corps. That has pluses in people's minds and negatives in people's minds. But I want to tell you a personal story, as well. I remember well the stories that my father would tell me of his precious year that he spent in the CCC in Minnesota. He planted trees—built roads and dams, and worked on a host of conservation projects that still stand today, right across from Steve's district. He went from northwestern Minnesota down to southeastern Minnesota, in the Waynesboro area. The CCC saved my dad's family farm in the great depression. It got a farm kid off the plains and into the woods for the first time in his life. It taught my dad how to work and get along with others, and today, across America, there are three billion trees—mighty sentinels—which stand as

daily reminders of what young people can do in just one small project if we let them.

And this isn't a symbolic thing, that we have three billion trees; they produce all kinds of clean air, good oxygen, soil and water conservation, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, timber and tourism industries. And it helped keep my dad in the State of Minnesota. That program was the reason that he stayed in Minnesota and didn't go to a larger city to try to find a job.

A 1985 Congressional Research Service study stated that "From nearly every social standpoint, the operations of the CCC have paid very practical tangible—as well as intangible—dividends to the United States." In looking at other programs similar to the American Conservation Corps they went on to say, "Social benefits are substantial. In addition to increased employability and earnings, these benefits include certain direct savings to society through reduced welfare and unemployment insurance costs and lower crime rates." So when we look at the $75 million figure, we not only see a very small number in light of what we're doing, but also some real cost savings to the Government, as well.

Well, these are just some of the benefits America would reap, and we know we have the need. In terms of unmet needs, in 1984 the Forest Service estimated it had a backlog of $1.25 billion in projects which could be undertaken by youth conservation program personnel. By the way, these are projects that will never be done unless we have a youth conservation corps. They don't have the personnel. They won't ever get the money. They just won't be undertaken unless we adopt it. And they won't be done until we adopt something like this. There are 32 million days of tree planting and 78 million days of stand improvement work in our national parks and on other public lands, more than 400,000 person-years of labor, returning 10 percent on investment.

This isn't just an idea of getting kids into the woods and doing something for national parks. This is a 10 percent return on our investment for our economy. Our timber stands are an important part of our timber industry that employs, at last look, about three million people in this country and produces several billion dollars in economic benefits to our economy.

We know the bottom-line benefits for America: better conservation of precious resources; improved parks; marine life and wildlife resources; more productive timber; tourism and recreational industries; reduced unemployment; welfare, crime, and health care costs—all of those have money.

I want to focus on the most significant benefit of this program for America. It gives an opportunity for our young people to give a little back to the country that nurtured them.

I think we can expect too much from programs such as this. We can expect education and training—they'll get a little bit of education and training. We can expect that they will meet huge unmet needs—we'll do a little bit of that. We can expect that we can do it without hurting the deficit, and it may be helping the deficit—we'll do a little bit of that.

The most important thing is the idea of building character and of citizenship. The service that they render to others becomes the rent

we pay for our room on this planet, part of the ticket to our American citizenship.

Our youth are searching for purpose in the midst of baffling change and confusion and danger. The numbers, in terms of—a third of our kids are born into poverty, grow up in poverty. Suicide rates, illegitimacy rates, a whole host of crime rates and associated unemployability that comes from that environment is very costly, as well.

For too long, the bottom line has been consumption of nature's resources, individual wealth and personal gain. We have been told, and we know at our very core, that the bottom line does not measure the awe of our natural resources, the happiness of our children, the beauty of our poetry, the intelligence of our public debate, the integrity of our public officials, or the quality of our lives. The American Conservation Corps begins to rebuild a sense of American community and common experience and purpose and affection and respect which tie us together as Americans.

For the spirit of patriotism to alight again, American needs leadership. Such leadership brought us the Peace Corps under John Kennedy. President Reagan's leadership, when Governor of California, led to the California Ecology Corps, the predecessor of the California Conservation Corps. These programs have enjoyed tremendous bipartisan support. I believe the American Conservation Corps deserves this kind of support as well, and I urge the subcommittee to provide the leadership and act quickly on this bill, thereby renewing our commitment to our young people and our natural resources.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Gerry Sikorski follows:]

CONGRESSMAN
GERRY SIKORSKI
NEWS RELEASE

414 Cannon House Office Building • Washington, D.C. 20515 • 202-225-2271

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GERRY SIKORSKI
MAY 21, 1987
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you in strong support of H.R. 18, Mo Udall's American Conservation Corps Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill because it's an important step in improving America's natural resources, training America's youth, and developing a new American spirit of citizenship. The American Conservation Corps is consistent with the greater ideal of national service which our country sorely needs today.

Sixty years ago today, on May 21, 1927, a young American who hailed from Minnesota stood in the dark night hours on the soil of France completing the first trans-Atlantic flight. A new American hero and a fine example of what young Americans can do...if given a chance. The A.C.C. celebrates that spirit, and celebrates America's new patriots. It encourages America's young people to reject the corruption seen at the White House, on Wall Street and the pulpits, and become involved in their communities, protect America's environment, soar to new heights, and develop a collective spirit of patriotism that comes from working for the common good.

A smaller version of the American Conservation Corps exists in my own state of Minnesota, and it is highly successful. Across the nation, there are now some 40 state and local conservation corps, created in the last few years.

These and other youth service programs are exploding with success. Of the youth involved, there is no question of their energy, of their ability, and of their honest commitment to a better and more decent America. The individuals fighting in the trenches for these youth programs have struggled and sacrificed alone too long. It is now up to us in Congress to make the effort to take their cause as our own. We must provide an opportunity for all of our country's youth to make America better. The A.C.C. is a significant step.

The American Conservation Corps is modeled after the Civilian Conservation Corps. I remember well the stories that my father would tell me of that precious year he spent in the C.C.C. in Minnesota. He planted trees, built roads and dams, and worked on a host of conservation programs that still stand today -- protecting the land and water, producing wildlife and making Minnesota a better place to live. The C.C.C. saved my dad's family farm in the Great Depression. It got a farm kid off the plains and into the woods. It taught my dad how to work and get along with others. And today across America there are 3 billion trees -- mighty sentinels-- which stand as daily reminders of what young people can do in just one small project if we let them.

A 1985 Congressional Research Service study stated that "From nearly every social standpoint, the operations of the C.C.C. have paid very practical tangible (as well as intangible) dividends to the United States." In further research done on programs similar to the American Conservation Corps, C.R.S. reported :

> ...social benefits are substantial. In addition to increased employability and earnings, these benefits could include certain direct savings to society through reduced welfare and unemployment insurance costs and lower crime rates.

These are just some of the benefits America would reap, and we know we have the need. In 1986, the Forest Service estimated that it had a backlog of $1.25 billion in projects which could be undertaken by youth conservation program personnel -- and this figure has grown and is growing. And the use of Conservation Corps, CRS points out, is the most effective way to decrease the health and safety problems which G.A.O. has identified as being prominent in our National Parks.

At a proposed $75 million annual authorization, the U.S Forest Service backlog alone could provide more than 16 years of work for the American Conservation Corps. There are 32 million days of tree planting and 78 million days of stand improvement work in our national parks on other public lands -- more than 400,000 person-years of labor, returning 10 percent on investment.

We know the bottom line benefits for America: better conservation of precious resources, improved parks, marine life and wildlife resources; more productive timber tourism and recreational industries; reduced unemployment, welfare, crime, and health care.

However, the most significant benefit of this program for America is that it gives opportunity for America's young to give a little back to the country that nurtured them. The service that they render to others becomes the rent we pay for our room on this planet; part of the ticket to American citizenship.

America's youth are searching for purpose in the midst of baffling change, confusion, and danger. We are losing many of our active and committed youth to indifference and the almighty financial bottom line. We have grown perhaps too efficient at counting money and not efficient enough at measuring what gives satisfaction to our own minds and hearts.

For too long the bottom line has been consumption of natures resources, individual wealth and personal gain. We have been told and we know at our very core that the bottom line does not measure the awe of our natural wonders, the happiness of our children, the beauty of our poetry, the intelligence of our public debate, the integrity of our public officials, or the quality of our lives. It can tell us everything about America, except what makes us proud to be Americans.

The A.C.C. begins to rebuild our sense of American community and common experience and purpose and affection and respect -- which tie us together as Americans.

For the spirit of patriotism to alight again, America needs leadership. Such leadership brought us the Peace Corps under John F. Kennedy. President Reagan's leadership when Governor of California led to the California Ecology Corps -- the predecessor of the California Conservation Corps. These programs have enjoyed tremendous bipartisan support and I believe that the A.C.C. deserves this kind of support as well. I urge this subcommittee to provide the leadership and act quickly on this bill, thereby renewing our commitment to our young people and our natural resources.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Congressman Sikorski. I hope that you can wait until we hear from Mr. Frank Petty.

Mr. SIKORSKI. I think I can.

Mr. MARTINEZ. All right.

With that I'd like to turn to Mr. Frank Petty, Vice President, Shell Oil Company. I am one of your customers. [Laughter.]

STATEMENT OF FRANK PETTY, SENIOR REPRESENTATIVE, SHELL OIL CORP., AND CHAIRMAN, TEXAS CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. PETTY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to say that I appreciate the upgrade in my title to Vice President. I think for the record I'd better let you know that I'm a Senior Representative of Shell Oil Company.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Okay. We're looking to the future, though. [Laughter.]

Mr. PETTY. Thank you.

I am here in my capacity as chairman of the Texas Conservation Corps, chairman of the Board of Directors.

Having been appointed to the Board of TCC as a representative of Shell and having just completed a three-year term as a member of the Houston, Private Industry Council, I would like to direct my remarks to three points that I think are key to this bill: work projects of conservation corps and the benefits that are derived from them; employment and the training of our youth; and, finally, the private sector support of such programs.

The Texas Conservation Corps was created in 1985 by Executive Order of Governor Mark White, a copy of which is attached to the handout, and it is currently being continued by Governor Bill Clements. I point this out to underscore the continuity. If we can make the transition from a Democratic administration to a Republican administration, I think this speaks well for the conservation corps' programs.

We will probably never see another completely Federally-funded program on the scale of those of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, and I don't think that's what we're looking for. Perhaps it's not the most desireable thing for many different reasons. The TCC uses a concept of marshaling multiple groups of funding sources to reinforce and promote training. That's the approach that we use in Texas. We are funded by our local JTPA service delivery areas, which are generally known as PITS, with JTPA monies. We are also funded from the State with what we call our Texas education money. And then we are funded, of course, by private sector contributions.

We are funded, finally, by fees that these young people earn from contract services that they perform for municipalities and agencies.

We serve approximately 300 young people on a year-round basis. We serve another 25 young people in special summer programs, targeted for a lower age group than the 18 to 21.

Our goal basically is to teach the work ethic, and this, I think, is very, very important. We can talk about skills training; we can talk about educational upgrade, but if we don't talk about young

people having the work ethic, then we don't talk about a viable, competitive work force, and that's what the private sector and the public sector, indeed, will need in the future.

I think this is very basic to this program. In addition to that, we are directing our attention at the so-called "high risk" kids. These are young people who probably, if they stayed in their respective communities under the normal JTPA program as we know it, chances are they may drop out of that program or simply be recycled back through that program. What we attempt to do in Texas is to take these young people into a residential setting away from their homes and carry them through a very strict, disciplinary, work-ethic kind of experience, up to a period of six months.

I have traveled across the State of Texas from the urban areas of Houston to the Valley, and I have seen young people come from all over the State of Texas into this program. And when you bring a group of young people who are unemployed, Mr. Chairman, bring them into a situation where they have to get up at 5:00 o'clock in the morning and begin to work and learn how to pack their lunch and to go out to a work site, get involved into a project, and then bring them back at the end of that workday and say, "Now, look, you have some educational deficiencies. You need to upgrade yourself and get yourself a GED. There's a class that's going to last until 9:00 o'clock. Go to it." And when you begin to see those young people get involved in those programs—not only in developing the work ethic, but being concerned about their own individual upgrading—I think you will see the results of the return on the dollar.

We are pleased to see the provisions in this bill that provide for review of and comment on proposals by the State Job Training Coordinating Councils. I think when we started the program in Texas, one of the first things that we looked at was, basically, where are we going to get the monies. I think this is a concern of everybody. Well, JTPA dollars are out there; and the population that JTPA serves is basically the very same population that this bill talks about. I must hastily say, though, that I think there are a lot of young people who do not fall into the JTPA definition who could certainly benefit from the work ethic that is promoted by this program.

But nevertheless, we went to the State Coordinating Councils in Texas and we got a pledge from the Councils that we would work with every Private Industry Council throughout the State of Texas. We are still in the process of developing that, but the reception has been very, very good.

I want to point out one other thing, that in reviewing the legislative history of this bill I have seen the issue of what corporate America is willing to do in support of this program. The Board of Directors of the Texas Conservation Corps has, or has had, representatives of Atlantic Richfield Company, Tenneco, Brown & Root, Exxon, Allied Travel, Petro, Sun Exploration Company, Warren Electric, as well as Shell. In addition to helping design and shape the policy as Board members, the private sector has been an important part of my funding. I have attached to the handout I've given you the listing of funds that we've received from the private sector, some $400,000, untold numbers of dollars in indirect services, that have made this program operate in the State of Texas. And we

think that that, in itself, is an indication of the kind of support that the private sector will give not only in Texas, but across the country, providing that they can see something very positive other than what we've been able to provide them through the normal programs that we have in existence. I think that this work ethic concept is very basic and very key to the success that we have with our young people who are to benefit from this program.

Let me point out that in the TCC, we attempt to serve the most at-risk youth. This is where we think the payoff is in terms of our investment. In Texas, 85 percent of our prison inmates are high school dropouts; 67 percent of the people on welfare are dropouts; 62 percent of the people earning below the poverty line are dropouts. Minority youth unemployment in Texas exceeds 50 percent in some areas of our State. These kinds of statistics scare us.

I think across the pages of the printed media we see every day the toll that is being taken by this country as a whole—the taxpayers, what have you—when we have large numbers of people who are unemployed, who are incapable of making that transition where they are contributing members of society. If we don't pay for it through legislation of this kind, we will pay for it through prisons. I think we all know that we're practically saturated; we can't afford to build prisons any more at the rate that we need them. And if the rate of crime continues at the pace that it's going, we're going to have a problem far more serious on our hands than we have, and certainly one far more serious and far more important than the mere pittance that we're asking for in terms of dollars in this legislation.

There are many programs around that teach job-specific skills, such as auto mechanics, computer programmers, typists, but we believe many youth today need more basic training. And again, I reemphasize training and the work ethic. How to get up day in and day out and go to work, how to follow instructions, how to work with others as part of a team. These are attributes that employers are looking for in employees. That is what an American Conservation Corps can teach our young people. Although we have a successful small conservation corps in Texas, we support the American Conservation Corps bill because it would give us a broader and more stable funding base, allowing us to expand this program to serve more youth.

We urge your favorable consideration of this bill, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Frank E. Petty follows:]

STATEMENT OF MR. FRANK E. PETTY
SR. REPRESENTATIVE
SHELL OIL COMPANY
AND
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
TEXAS CONSERVATION CORPS
BEFORE
THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE
CONCERNING H.R. 18
THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. Chairman. My name is Frank Petty, and I am here in my capacity as Chairman of the Board of The Texas Conservation Corps (TCC).

Having been appointed to the Board of TCC as a representative of Shell Oil Company and having just completed a three-year term as a member of the Houston Private Industry Council, I would like to direct my remarks to three aspects of the American Conservation Corps Bill: (a) work projects of Conservation Corps and the benefits derived therefrom; (b) employment and training of our youth; and (c) private sector support of such programs.

The Texas Conservation Corps was created in 1985 by Executive Order of Governor Mark White, a copy of which is attached, and is being continued as a Governor's Model Youth Program under the new administration of Governor Bill Clements. I point this out only to underscore the bipartisan support TCC enjoys (and believe me if a program can survive such a change in the Texas political scene, it has strong support).

We will probably never see another completely federally funded program on the scale of the old Civilian Conservation Corps. Perhaps it is not even desirable. The TCC uses a concept of marshaling multiple funding sources to accomplish a multiplicity of purposes.

We are funded by local service delivery areas (SDA) with Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) training dollars, state-level JTPA education coordination funds, private sector contributions, and fees we earn for work performed for governmental entities. We serve approximately 300 youth a year in our year around residential program and will serve another 250 to 300 in non-residential summer programs.

Our goal is to teach the "work ethic" to 18 to 21 year old economically disadvantaged youth and place them in private sector jobs when they complete the program. We believe that the way to learn good work habits and attitudes and how to work hard is to do hard work.

Our Corpsmembers do that hard work on projects ranging from restoration of the historic Battleship Texas to building drainage systems in the "Colonias" (rural slum subdivisions in the Lower Rio Grande Valley). We've planted palm trees in McAllen, cleared tall timber for a public golf course in the piney woods north of Houston, and installed low-flow shower heads and other water conservation devices in the city of Austin.

As valuable and cost effective as these and other projects have been for the taxpayers of Texas, our emphasis is on saving and developing our most valuable resource - our young people.

We are pleased to see the provisions in this bill that provide for review and comment of proposals by the State Job Training Coordinating Councils and Private Industry Councils. If, as we do, you view the American Conservation Corps as not only a program to perform valuable public projects, but also as a vehicle to prepare our youth to become productive employable citizens, it makes sense to coordinate with JTPA.

Speaking of JTPA and the public/private partnership it represents, leads me to my last point - private sector support for a program such as the American Conservation Corps. In reviewing the legislative history of this bill, I have seen the issue of whether "Corporate America" would support a program such as this.

The Board of Directors of the Texas Conservation Corps has or has had representatives of Atlantic Richfield Company, Tenneco, Brown and Root, Exxon, Allied Travel and Petro, Sun Exploration Company, Warren Electric, as well as Shell Oil Company. In addition to helping design and shape policy as board members, the private sector has been an important part of our funding. In a little over a year and half, we have received nearly $400,000 in contributions. A list of our private sector contributors is attached.

This kind of support, especially during the hardest economic times Texas has seen in years, is evidence of the attitude of the private sector for worthwhile programs such as Conservation Corps.

We do it for many reasons:

We love our country and we want to do our part to protect our environment and conserve our resources.

In the TCC we try to serve the hardest to serve and the most at risk youth. In Texas 85% of prison inmates are high school drop-outs, 67% of the people on welfare are drop-outs, 62% of the people earning below the poverty line are drop-outs. Minority youth unemployment exceeds 50% in some areas of our state. Those kind of statistics scare us. If we don't pay now, we will pay later, and it will be much more expensive.

There are many programs around that teach job specific skills such as auto mechanics, computer programming, typing, etc., but we believe many youth today need much more basic training. Training in the work ethic -- how to get up day in and day out and go to work, how to follow instructions, how to work with others as part of a team -- these are attributes employers are looking for in employees. That is what an American Conservation Corps can teach our young people.

Although we have a successful small Conservation Corps in Texas, we support the American Conservation Corps bill because it would give us a broader and more stable funding base allowing us to expand the program to serve more youth. We urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

Thank you.

5/87

THE STATE OF TEXAS
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
AUSTIN, TEXAS

August 9, 1985
EXECUTIVE ORDER
MW- 34

CREATING THE TEXAS CONSERVATION CORPS

WHEREAS, youth unemployment rates continue at more than twice the national average; and

WHEREAS, the State of Texas is committed to serving our young people by preparing them with the knowledge and skills, and providing the opportunities to enter the work force as productive citizens; and

WHEREAS, the economy of Texas is healthy and growing, and the business and industrial community of our state has a continuing need for qualified workers; and

WHEREAS, young citizens who are systematically excluded from economic participation and meaningful work experience become a tragic waste of resources and a costly burden to our society, and

WHEREAS, the quality of life of the citizens of Texas is enhanced by the preservation, conservation, and development of our natural and historic resources; and

WHEREAS, I have designated the Texas Educational Foundation to be the administrative entity to operate the Texas Conservation Corps, and

WHEREAS, I have appointed the Texas Conservation Corps Advisory Board composed of representatives of business and industry, state agencies, and environmental groups who serve at the pleasure of the Governor, without compensation or reimbursement of expenses, to provide policy guidance and private sector support for the program,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Mark White, Governor of the State of Texas, do hereby establish the Texas Conservation Corps, as a Governor's Model Youth Program.

The Texas Conservation Corps is hereby charged with but not limited to the following functions and responsibilities:

(1) to provide a work/education program that will prepare young men and women 18 to 21 years of age for entry into the work force;

(2) to provide the business and industrial community of Texas with a pool of workers who have proven ability and who have good work habits and attitudes;

(3) to conserve, preserve, and develop the natural and historical resources of our state, both public and private;

(4) to assist in establishing local community service and/or conservation corps programs;

(5) to assist governmental and other disaster relief organizations in responding to natural disasters and other emergencies.

The Texas Conservation Corps shall be funded primarily from appropriate federal funds, private sector funds, available state resources such as surplus property, and any fee for service contracts which it may negotiate with public or private entities.

All state agencies, boards and commissions are hereby directed to assist fully the Texas Conservation Corps and its Administrative Entity in carrying out its responsibilities.

This executive order shall be effective immediately and shall remain in full force and effect until modified, amended, or rescinded.

Given under my hand this 8th day of August, 1985

MARK WHITE
Governor of Texas

Myra A. McDaniel
Secretary of State

Filed in the Office of
Secretary of State

AUG 9 1985

Statutory Filings Division
Statutory Documents

TEXAS CONSERVATION CORPS
CONTRIBUTOR LIST

	DATE	CONTRIBUTOR	AMOUNT
1.	01/08/85	Cameron Iron Works	$ 2,500.00
2.	01/11/85	Exxon	20,000.00
3.	01/31/85	Sun Oil Company	20,000.00
4.	05/24/85	Transcontinental Gas & Pipeline Corp	5,500.00
5.	06/11/85	Tenneco, Inc.	20,000.00
6.	07/12/85	Warren Electric Co.	20,000.00
7.	08/08/85	Brown & Root, Inc.	2,000.00
8.	08/27/85	Houston Lighting & Power	10,000.00
9.	09/03/85	Shell Oil Company	20,000.00
10.	09/11/85	Texas Utilities Electric Co.	5,000.00
11.	09/20/85	DuPont	5,000.00
12.	09/24/85	United States Steel	2,500.00
13.	10/22/85	Sun Exploration & Production Co.	20,000.00
14.	11/04/85	Frito Lay, Inc.	2,400.00
15.	12/16/85	Atlantic Richfield Foundation	40,000.00
16.	01/15/86	Brown & Root, Inc.	2,000.00
17.	02/11/86	Exxon Company U.S.A.	25,000.00
18.	03/19/86	DuPont	5,000.00
19.	04/17/86	Trull Foundation	4,000.00
20.	04/24/86	Shell Oil Company	20,000.00
21.	05/01/86	Tenneco, Inc.	20,000.00
22.	05/20/86	Warren Electric Co.	10,000.00
23.	07/22/86	Houston Natural Gas	20,000.00
24.	08/13/86	Cameron Iron Works	1,000.00
25.		Houston Lighting and Power	2,500.00
26.		Southwestern Bell Telephone	10,000.00
27.		ARCO	1,000.00
28.		Exxon	15,000.00
29.		Sun Exploration and Production Co.	500.00
30.		Mary Kay Cosmetics (Personal Care Products)	
31.		Dr. Clay Smith (Computer Hardware and Software)	
32.		Mr. Morgan (San Antonio) (Computer Hardware and Software)	
33.		Farrah Clothing (Uniform Slacks)	
34.		Justin Boot Company (Boots)	
35.		Gulf Oil Company (Shoes)	

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Petty.

A theme that runs through your presentation is that H.R. 18 is beneficial. It's beneficial to the State of Texas and it's beneficial to the young people involved, and I think that's something that we've got to keep in mind. You made me a statement about "pay me now or pay me later," and it reminded me of that commercial where a guy is holding an oil filter, and he says, "You pay me now or pay me later," and the inference was that it was going to cost you a lot more later. And your reference——

Mr. SIKORSKI. Was that a Shell oil filter? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes, it was a Shell oil filter. But the inference was that it was going to cost much more later, and I think we can make the same analogy here. I read not too long ago a statistic of what it costs to educate and train one of these people. The example was Job Corps, and the cost of training a person through Job Corps, in some cases, was less than $2,000. In that same vein, it would cost something well in excess of $20,000 to incarcerate that same person for a year. And I think that's what we're talking about—giving young people alternatives.

Here, again, there are several States that have programs similar to this, and we're going to hear from some of them later. But how is it that even though the States have realized the value of these programs, we're still having difficulty convincing the Administration of the value of this? I think there's an irony there that we alluded to earlier. The same program was promoted and sold and fought for in California by the same person that pocket-vetoed it here in Washington. How do we get across that we need this, and we need this now?

Mr. PETTY. Well, I don't have a magic answer to that, Mr. Chairman, but I would think that one of the things that we have to look at—in Texas, not too long ago, we were flying very, very high. We really didn't regard ourselves as having a problem, certainly not a problem of employment, certainly not a problem of earning capacity of people. But we did do something that was unique that prompted us to go in this direction. We took a look at our education programs and we began to look at the number of dropouts that we had in the State of Texas. Of course, you know, the population mix in the State of Texas, the high Hispanic mix—this was a point of real concern because, we said, if we were going to be competitive, certainly, we would have to do something about our educational system. And as we got into that study and looked at those figures we found out that there was a direct correlation, as was made earlier here, between school dropouts, unemployment and all other kinds of related social problems. And it was the feeling of the Governor's office on model youth programs that this was something that we had to get involved in. If we didn't have enough State money or Federal money, we had to go out and get some private sector money and some other ways of doing it. And this was what we tried to do.

Mr. SIKORSKI. I think what we need to do is to get people to go to these projects. They're all over. Go to the Texas project. Go to the California project, Iowa, Minnesota—there are 40 State and local programs around the country. These aren't namby-pamby easy deals. They get up early; they're under very strict discipline; they

learn a very strong work ethic. And I think we might be talking around—Steve raises issues that—all I can say is, first of all, don't expect miracles from a $75 million program. Think of what we do in the Department of Agriculture; $75 million is nothing. It's a drop in this water glass. Think of what we do in Department of Defense; $75 million is only a third of what Wedtech got away with up in New York. It's not that big a deal; $75 million, and we can't expect miracles. But if we go to these projects and see these kids getting up early, marching around, doing their work, getting caught goofing off and the rest of it, you understand that these are the very principles that Ronald Reagan has spoken eloquently and beautifully about, the kinds of principles that conservatives, liberals, Republicans and Democrats can feel very good about, that are being instilled in a group of people without which—without this program, they'd never get those principles.

Let me also say that we can argue in Education and Labor that this is an Education and Labor program. We can argue over in Interior that it's a conservation program. It's a little bit of both, but really, it's a citizenship program, trying to deal with some young people who probably wouldn't get certain principles about work ethic and discipline without it, and we know that the numbers pay off. There are a couple reports from CRS that show tremendous numbers in terms of reduced crime rates, reduced rates of unemployment, reduced rates of welfare and unemployment compensation, as well as meeting some needs that would go totally unmet.

I'd like for people to just appreciate that point in response to your question. It's a citizenship issue. It helps them train, it helps education, it helps meet unmet needs, it helps reduce the deficit; but most important of all, it helps build better citizens who will pay off directly later on.

Mr. MARTINEZ. You answered all the questions that I was going to ask you, Gerry. I'm very impressed with your testimony. You've hit some very important points, and I think we have to keep hammering these home.

I would turn to Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank both of you for your statements.

Mr. Petty, you hit on what I think is probably the solution to this whole issue, and that is to find a way in which we can implement and coordinate this program through the Job Training Partnership Act, and I'd really appreciate it if you could provide this subcommittee with an in-depth summary of how the Texas program interacts with the Job Training Partnership Program.

Let me give you a couple of examples. In the Summer Youth Employment Program we spend $700 million out of Job Training Partnership Act monies for Summer Youth. In the Basic Grant Program for disadvantaged Adults and Youth, we spend $1.8 billion, of which 40 percent must be spent on youth, which is about $750 million. And as Gerry is suggesting here, $75 million is perhaps not a lot of money. If we could find a way to fold this program in through the Job Training Partnership Act, we're going to make resources available of a significantly higher proportion than presently exists. Senator Simon suggested, for example, that we ought to use the Job Training Partnership Act to do screening and assess-

ment upon entry into the program, and I would ask both of you and everyone here today to begin considering if that isn't a means by which we can make available this opportunity. We can have Federal resources there, but we can also get at the targeting and training and education concerns that I have. Very frankly, we may be able to make everybody happy here and get something passed into law.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Let's focus on that—I don't know about the time; we may have a vote on the journal——

Mr. MARTINEZ. We already do. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIKORSKI. I guess we do have a vote.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me interrupt, Gerry——

Mr. SIKORSKI. I notice in the bill, on page 11 under Joint Projects, there is a provision specifically authorizing and encouraging this arrangement. One of the problems you get into, and I failed to mention this, the Army Corps of Engineers has specifically highlighted this, as has TVA and others—I know the Army Corps of Engineers is very active along the Mississippi, on Iowa's eastern border, as it is along the Wisconsin-Minnesota border, as well. Those might fit under the Job Training Partnership Act, and the might not. We don't want to go so far in that direction that we preclude the kinds of projects that would be beneficial to our States and the Army Corps of Engineers and others.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me turn to Mr. Grandy. And let me say that since we're in this building, I know we can get to the vote in less than five minutes, so even when the 10-minute buzzer goes off we still have five minutes. So let me allow Mr. Grandy to take that five minutes. Then we'll dismiss the panel and allow them to go on their way, and we'll recess for 10 minutes and go over to vote.

Mr. GRANDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was curious when I was looking over the bill. On page 19, under "Special Responsibilities," is this basically the pay scale that you have outlined here, Mr. Sikorski, for people that would enroll into this program? Do I understand this correctly to be——

Mr. SIKORSKI. As I understand it, it is. I have to admit that standing in for Mo Udall is a big responsibility. And as I understand it, what we're talking about is roughly minimum wage.

Mr. GRANDY. It would be a minimum wage?

Mr. SIKORSKI. As I understand it, the summary that came out of his office talks about a minimum wage. I couldn't figure out, projecting from 95 percent of an enlistee's——

Mr. GRANDY. I was kind of hoping you would be able to answer that, because I certainly——

Mr. SIKORSKI. Well, we will get that for you.

Mr. GRANDY. I guess my question is that if it's not minimum wage, if it's beneath the minimum wage, are you suggesting that we would have, perhaps, some kind of a subminimum wage or youth minimum wage to make this program viable, or would you want to maintain the pay scale at the minimum wage, no matter what it becomes?

Mr. SIKORSKI. As I understand it, it's not beneath it. The summary says that corps members would be paid approximately minimum wage.

Mr. GRANDY. Approximately minimum wage. So if the minimum wage goes up, then the pay scale for the program would go up? That's what you see?

Mr. SIKORSKI. We will find that out, Fred. I don't want to say that that's the case without checking it out with Mo Udall.

Mr. GRANDY. Finally, not having looked through the whole bill, I am reading pages 6 and 7 where you were reading off the kinds of projects that would be used here. Would it be possible for a State to design its own slate of projects? Because it's conceivable that a State like Iowa, a State like Minnesota, a State like Wisconsin would have different needs.

Mr. SIKORSKI. In fact, that's why it's embraced that way.

Mr. GRANDY. You refer to the Secretary of Agriculture in this legislation fairly regularly. It seems to me that Soil Conservation Service should be included in this somewhere. But in a State like Iowa, you might have a greater need for participation in that than you would, perhaps, in the Forest Service, which is not as great.

Do States have the flexibility to design a program that will concentrate on their environmental needs?

I guess we'd better adjourn, right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SIKORSKI. I think definitely yes. The application procedure is such that the program ideas come from a local basis and get approved, and we know that State and local nonprofits are going to be the generating forces for these programs.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me announce that we've been joined by Jim Jontz from Indiana, who has acquiesced to not ask any questions at this time so we can get over and vote.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Let me also thank the subcommittee for allowing me to come this morning.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, and we'll recess for 10 minutes.

[Recess.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. Since the two most important members of this committee are here, the Chairman and the ranking minority member, we'll go ahead and get started.

I'd like to introduce the next panel, a very distinguished group of people.

We have, first of all, Barry Tindall, who is Associate Director of the National Recreation and Park Association. We have Raul Yzaguirre, a very good friend, President of the National Council of La Raza; we have William Basl, President, National Association of Service Conservation Corps; and we have Michael Bailin, President, Public/Private Ventures, Inc. Last but not least, we have Debra Fremstad, Pierce County, Wisconsin Conservation Corps Member, I will turn to Mr. Gunderson to allow him to make an introduction.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to correct the list of witnesses and indicate that Debra Fremstad is not from Pierce County; she's from Trempealeau County.

Let me share with you all a rather humorous story about what's called "peer pressure." Debra Fremstad happens to be not only a constituent of mine and a neighbor of mine back home, so they brought her out here to testify and try to convince me on the par-

ticular legislation that is in front of us, but above and beyond that they've also chosen someone who is a relative of mine.[Laughter.]

Now, if you think that's bad news, let me tell you that in every dark cloud there is a silver lining. And as I was talking with Debbie yesterday, she indicated that, yes, indeed, this was her first time to Washington, D.C. So if I have done nothing else by my opposition last year, Deb, I got you a trip to Washington, and it wasn't all bad.

So with that, I appreciate the Chairman allowing her to testify first so that I can get over to the floor and participate in the floor debate on an education bill that I'm very involved with in another subcommittee. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

And, Deb, I want to welcome you not only to Washington, but to our hearing.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Ms. Fremstad, I can't help but take the opportunity to needle Steve a little bit. Because he was in opposition, at that time you removed him to about fifth cousin or something, right? As distant as you could? [Laughter.]

If he does the right thing this time you'll restore him to his proper place, right?

Thank you. With that, you might begin.

STATEMENT OF DEBRA K. FREMSTAD, TREMPEALEAU COUNTY, WI, CORPS MEMBER IN THE WISCONSIN CONSERVATION CORPS

Ms. FREMSTAD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having me here today, and thank you, Steve, for my trip to Washington, D.C. I am a 23-year-old corps member of the Wisconsin Conservation Corps.

In July of 1986, I moved back to my home town from another State. I couldn't believe how much things had changed in the area in the two years that I was gone. Jobs that were always scarce were almost nonexistent.

I heard about the Wisconsin Conservation Corps through a friend of mine. I applied for the job. I was accepted, and I began work.

I've always been interested in conservation, wildlife, nature, and being able to combine an interest and a job has made this a very special year for me.

As a member of the corps, I've played a part in completing various projects around Trempealeau County. I have helped to build and maintain hiking trails, skiing trails; I have mended pheasant pens; I have done timber stand improvement; built and placed wood duck houses and fish cribs, and other projects that improve and enhance our natural resources in Trempealeau County.

As a result of working in this program, I learned valuable skills that will help me in the career that I have chosen.

We use a variety of power tools in our jobs, and I have learned to use each and every one of them. I use a chain saw. I have learned to use skil saws, power tools, power drills. I learned minor carpentry skills; the proper care and maintenance of such tools; safe usage of tools, and first aid, which also comes in handy in everyday life.

This job had a lot to do with my choice in a career. I've always wanted to further my education, but I didn't know where I wanted my life to go. I've enjoyed working in this program so much that I

have chosen to go into a similar field, which is wildlife management.

As an added incentive, the Conservation Corps offers a $1,000 scholarship and encourages young people to further their education.

The Conservation Corps has been the most enriching and rewarding year of my life to date. The corps has given me more than new knowledge and skills. I have also gained pride in the work that I have accomplished, and a new direction in life. My grandfather worked for the Civilian Conservation Corps. I have had the opportunity to work in the Wisconsin Conservation Corps, and I hope with all my heart that these programs continue for people in future generations.

I thank you for having me.

[The prepared statement of Debra K. Fremstad follows:]

Statement of Debra K. Fromstad
Corps Member in Wisconsin Conservation Corps
Before the House
Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities

May 18, 1987

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having me here today. My name is Debbie Fromstad and I am a 23 year old Corps member in the Wisconsin Conservation Corps.

In July of 1986, I moved back to my hometown from another state. I couldn't believe how much things had changed in the two years I was gone. Jobs, which were always scarce, had become almost non-existent. I heard about the Wisconsin Conservation Corps, applied and was accepted for the job. I have always been interested in conservation and being able to combine an interest with work has made this a very special year for me.

As a member of the corps, I've played a part in completing various projects in my county. I've helped to build and maintain hiking and ski trails, mended pheasant pens, built and placed woodduck houses, built fish cribs, done timber stand improvement and many other projects that improve and enhance our natural resources and parks.

As a result of working in this program, I learned valuable skills that will help me in the career I have chosen. We use a variety of power tools in our work and I have learned to use them all. Tools such as chainsaws, skill saws and power drills. I also learned minor carpentry skills, proper care and maintenance of tools, safe usage of tools and first aid, which is also useful in everyday life.

This job had alot to do with my choice in a career. I've always wanted to further my education, but I never knew what I wanted to do with my life.

I've enjoyed working in this program so much, that I am going into a related field; Wildlife Management. As an added incentive, the Conservation Corps offers scholarships of $1,000.00 to encourage young people in the program to go on to school. I can honestly say that if it hadn't been for this program, I would probably never have decided to go to college.

To date, this has been the most enriching and rewarding year of my life. The Corps has given me more than knowledge and skills. I have also gained pride in the work I do and a direction in life.

My grandfather worked for the Civilian Conservation Corps; I had the opportunity to work for the Wisconsin Conservation Corps and I hope future generations will be granted these opportunities for years to come.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I know that Mr. Gunderson has to leave shortly to go to the floor, so I'm going to use the Chair's prerogative to allow Mr. Gunderson to question you if he wants to at this time, so that he can feel free to leave at any time he needs to.

Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Debbie, for not only very good testimony, but I think very heartwarming testimony.

One of the things which I noticed when I walked in this room today is that those of us who go through hearing after hearing here on Capitol Hill oftentimes walk into hearings that are a little bit cold and, should I say, a little bit boring. You could walk into this room today and tell that the people that are here are here from the heart. And I think that regardless of one's position on this particular bill, that in and of itself becomes very encouraging.

Yesterday afternoon, Debbie, we talked about some of my concerns about the lack of education and training provisions in H.R. 18 and the lack of targeting, etc. Without putting words in your mouth, yesterday afternoon you seemed rather positive on that aspect. You've heard our discussions this far this morning. Do you want to make any comments as to whether or not you think that directing the program a little bit more that way toward provision of education and training would be helpful?

Ms. FREMSTAD. I still am not quite sure what you mean by "directing."

Mr. GUNDERSON. Okay. For example, you have an interest in going into wildlife management. Perhaps as a part of your training, if your work would include some education and some training in the whole area of wildlife management—and not in your case, but in the case of some young people who may have some difficulties with basic educational skills, reading and writing, perhaps part of their time ought to be used while they are there—say, an hour a day—for that type of training, improving the basic reading skills so that they would have the opportunity.

You're going on to school. What I would like to do in this program is make sure that young people who are in this type of a work-related program will also get the assistance so that if they, like you, want to go on to school after this, and they need some basic educational skills to assist them to do that, then they will receive those skills as a part of their work-related experience so that they will be able to go on to college or technical school afterwards.

Ms. FREMSTAD. We did have a girl in our corps at the beginning of the year who had dropped out of high school. She did want the GED, and she was helped to get it. Should she want now to continue her education, that would help. It's not mandatory, but if those in the corps want to help themselves with their education the corps does encourage them.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Okay. Good. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

The more we get into the subject of combining the work part of it with education and training, the more I think back to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. There were many opportunities here, and they didn't do that type of thing. They felt that the experience itself was enough to give these people the kind of posi-

tive thinking so that they, on their own, would take advantage of educational opportunities back home. And I've got to say that the majority did. I know my two brothers did. And I imagine that in your experience with your co-workers in this program, you've seen the same thing.

I'm really of the opinion that we should incorporate what Mr. Gunderson is saying into this bill, where everything is voluntary. You can take a horse to water but you can't force him to drink; he's got to want to drink. So there has to be some volunteerism to it, but I think it's a tremendous idea.

In your experience, in the people that you work with, were there many that needed these basic skills?

Ms. FREMSTAD. There were two of my co-workers that did not graduate from high school, and both of them have gotten their GED's. Also we had people in the program that knew their basic skills; they probably didn't do as well in high school as they could have, but they did know their basic skills.

Mr. MARTINEZ. But there might be room for improvement?

Ms. FREMSTAD. Yes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. All right. Thank you very much.

With that, we'll turn to the next—oh, excuse me, I'm sorry. I forgot about you, Mr. Jontz. You're sitting over in that corner; you ought to get closer.

Mr. Jontz.

Mr. JONTZ. I appreciate your testimony.

I don't have any questions, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to hearing the other witnesses this morning, too.

Mr. MARTINEZ. All right. Thank you.

With that, we'll turn to Mr. Tindall.

STATEMENT OF BARRY TINDALL, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION

Mr. TINDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me also correct the title just slightly. I'm the Director of Public Affairs of the National Recreation and Park Association, reporting directly to our Executive Director.

There are so many different aspects of the legislation and of the goals and objectives in the area of conservation, education and so on, it's hard to figure out where to begin.

Let me note for the record that we are an organization of about 19,000 individuals, most of whom are employed or related in one way or another to public park and recreation systems; thus, we become part—maybe a major part—of the future managers and program designers who would be principally using the state and local components of this legislation.

I think it's important to point out that there are about 4,800 local park and recreation systems in this country. That gives you some idea of the context within which corps participants might find employment.

I've tried to outline four or five areas that I think are important to reference. Most of the points I would make, in fact, are covered in the legislation in one way or another, and therefore we don't have any great additional recommendations to make on the legisla-

tion per se, with one exception. That is up in the "purposes" part of the bill, we think it would be useful to elaborate a little bit or expand or maybe even use the term "use," if you will, U-S-E, in addition to the natural and cultural and other kinds of physical properties and work that are referenced there. Increasingly we are becoming a service-oriented society, and the same kinds of skills and educational experiences and things that we talk about, work habits and whatever, that are applicable to physical labor and projects and things like that also have the same transferability or application, if you will, through so-called service-type jobs, and also in principally public park and recreation or other public settings. So I would hope that conceptually, the legislation would embrace youth employment in other than physical, manual, outdoor kinds of projects. I think that's important because especially, if you're looking to employment for these people afterwards, many of them will find employment in that kind of opportunity.

I had the pleasure of working with a group called the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors, principally during calendar year 1986, and some of the ideas I might mention this morning relate to that experience.

One thing the Commission found and that others have found is that the American public demands a much higher degree of quality in its parks and recreation settings these days. And again, this speaks to things that a conservation corps can address; that is, improving the quality of recreation and other cultural and natural resources. There are many reasons why people are seeking quality over quantity these days, but it's important to mention that, I think, because corps projects, in fact, enhance the quality of public resources.

The need for facilities—another point that I would like to make—we often perceptually think of conservation as only "saving the land" or "saving the historical property" or something like that. In fact, it's the use of that resource by a human being, by the recreating public, that really is the interface between the human interest and the resource itself. And here, again, is an area where a corps can be extremely helpful because, in fact, much of the work that they do is user-project-related—trail systems, the restoration of facilities, things like that. This is where the human being and its potential, and the resource and its needs for restoration and what have you, come face to face.

A dimension of that is the quality and aesthetic aspects that you often find in public parks and recreation settings. It's important that corps participants, any learning experience for young people, job experience, emphasize the quality of the work, the quality of the project. And often you'll find that more frequently in public recreation settings, historic property restoration, etc., than you would in other settings. So that's an important dimension that I'd also like to mention.

Conserving the human resource—Congressman Gunderson and others have talked about the educational aspects. Congressman Sikorski and Senator Simon referenced that earlier. We would just emphasize and reemphasize what all of those gentlemen have said. It is part of the "pay me now or pay me later" notion. I don't want to make that too simplistic. You bring out the human value by

giving people meaningful things to do. Jesse Owens found his limelight in the Cleveland public park and recreation systems. I don't know what would have happened to that gentleman had he not had an experience in those settings. Albert Einstein spent a lot of time in the public park systems in Princeton, New Jersey. Erich Hoeffer, the great philosopher on the West Coast, wrote most of his philosophical essays as he wandered from bench to bench and trails down through Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. It's the setting, as has been referenced in other ways here this morning, that causes people to do their best, to gain a new appreciation of themselves and the context in which they live.

I would reference here, that we ought to—and I think that Congressman Gunderson also referenced this, as have others—we ought to be on the leading edge of dealing with the problem; that is, doing projects, involving people where there may be a high degree, a high possibility of risk. We shouldn't penalize people for failing in this program, whether we fail as a whole set of activities or whether we fail, some individuals, as part of a corps team or something like that. That shouldn't be a negative mark against the project. That's where other witnesses this morning talked about dealing—the Texas Conservation Corps, for example—with the most serious problems or potential problems. That's the kind of thing we ought to be dealing, in part, with in this program. We need to mix people and the backgrounds and things, but we really should be out on the leading edge of dealing with existing and future problems.

Let me hit the "close to home" thing. The Commission found that most recreation experiences occur within 15 minutes of home, 15 minutes by foot or bicycle, 10 miles by car or public transit. That begins to define where the pressures and needs are. It also begins to define where the work projects might occur for corps or related projects.

Extending public values—many people this morning have talked about linking American Conservation Corps projects with other job projects. We would suggest it extends far beyond that. There are opportunities in agriculture, housing, environmental maintenance, water quality, and so on. We ought to leverage many public values that are public investments. The American Conservation Corps does that just in conservation work and education work, and I don't think we've begun to scratch the surface and the potentials in that area.

Partnerships—all kinds of public and public/private partnerships ought to be, and in fact in many cases have been, the hallmark of this program. I don't know; maybe we need to look at some different institutional kinds of relationships between the Department of Education, Department of Labor, Interior, Agriculture and so on to really freshen things up a little bit in that regard. And there are all kinds of institutional barriers, among State agencies, for example. One Governor I heard referred to these State conservation agencies in his State as "banana republics" because of the barriers, the things they put up between each other. Maybe we need to look at those and try to soften those a little bit to make this program work better.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, let me also reference the Job Training Partnership Act. There is a tremendous amount of unused or underutilized fiscal resource authority in that program. That does not suggest that we do not create an American Conservation Corps; it suggests that we try to get some parallel goals and things going in these programs, do better by the youth aspects of JTPA, create an American Conservation Corps—maybe as a model, as a frontrunner to get JTPA focused on some of these things.

I would just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by noting that we're not talking about an open-ended authority here. We're talking about a three-year program. Yes, there are some State and local conservation corps doing some great things, but those corps ought to be the exception rather than the rule in this country. We have 30,000 local governments; we have 50 States, and Lord knows how many State agencies that ought to be doing things. We're talking about some modest investment to create, and encourage the creation of, conservation corps or allied types of programs. We think the investment is extremely modest and it's time to get on with this kind of program.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Barry S. Tindall follows:]

Statement of National Recreation and Park Association on the proposed American Conservation Corps before Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, U.S. House of Representatives, May 21, 1985.

Mr. Chairman of the Subcommittee: The National Recreation and Park Association appreciates the invitation to address legislation to create the American Conservation Corps. I am Barry S. Tindall, director of Public Affairs for the association. From November 1985 to December 1986 I served the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors as associate director for State and Local Systems and Resources. In January the commission recommended policy and program initiatives in 22 topical areas. Its report recognizes the significant contributions being made by state and local conservation corps. The Wisconsin Conservation Corps is featured among a number of case studies prepared for the commission and soon to be publically available.

NRPA is a national organization of some 19,000 individuals, agencies and organizations. Our members include civic leaders and professionals who guide, develop and manage recreation and park services and resources, principally but not exclusively in the public sector. Our members include people working at all levels of government, in the Armed Forces, in hospitals and other institutions serving special populations, and in academic settings. The NRPA membership would be centrally involved in the initiation and management of much of the activity authorized by this proposal.

We support the enactment of H.R. 18 and the creation of an American Conservation Corps. We recommend, however, some modification to selected parts of the bill, which we will note later in this statement.

The American Conservation Corps could address some of the principal contemporary and emerging issues in recreation resource conservation and use. These issues include:

- A higher standard of resource stewardship to meet public expectations of quality and service;
- The necessity to provide for appropriate facilities to aid and encourage public use;
- The need to "conserve" the human resource through employment and educational experiences;
- The need to focus increased attention on "close to home" recreation resources and services;
- The need to leverage additional public values out of many different types of public investments, and;
- The desirability of encouraging mutually beneficial partnerships among and between many public and private interests.

Each issue has some bearing on the need for the proposed Corps program, and the conditions under which it should be created and administered.

A Higher Standard of Stewardship

The American public today seeks quality over quantity. This attitude is not restricted to recreation settings and services, but has major implications for them. This attitude is fostered in part by "report close" private sector investments which some Americans use and which most are aware of. Statistically, the President's Commission found, people more frequently use recreation places that are highly attractive, well maintained and safe. Absent these characteristics use declines.

The Need for Facilities

Conservation is often perceived as "saving" land, historical or cultural resources. That clearly is a central part of public conservation goals. Public recreation use, however, often requires the development of facilities appropriate to the site and management goals. Capital development is a costly part of recreation, and is frequently labor intensive. Work in recreation settings often requires a high degree of attention to esthetics and quality--desirable "goals" to instill in people learning job skills.

The legislative history should clearly reflect the intent of Congress that Corps' programs will stress opportunities for teaching "quality" workmanship. This is an enduring legacy of many of the Civilian Conservation Corps projects, as well as other early public employment programs. The act and its history should also provide authority for involvement in project planning and development, on an advisory or consultant basis, of persons with professional land use or design skills, artisans or craftsmen.

'Conserving' the Human Resource

Recreation, and recreation places, have often been activities or settings instrumental in discovery, identity, and personal skill and character development. Jesse Owens developed his skills in Cleveland's play fields; Albert Einstein spent contemplative hours in Princeton's parks; Eric Hoffer crafted many of his philosophical essays in Golden Gate Park. Thus, it is highly appropriate that a program has the potential to combine work experiences in recreation and conservation settings.

Beyond these basic opportunities, however, certain areas where problems have historically arisen should be noted. Perhaps the most important is the need to involve those youth most "at risk," in both a personal and societal context. The recent history of the Job Training Partnership Act is instructive. Analysis of involvement by youth in that program is, according to some analysts, less than satisfactory because it has only marginally involved those youth most in need of work experiences, guidance, education and leadership. The act should provide program managers the flexibility to be highly imaginative and creative in dealing with youth in this category. It should encourage risk taking, and not penalize failure under difficult conditions.

A second area historically most susceptible to problems is the "education" element of programs. This was true in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and it appears to be true for the youth elements of JTPA. Frankly, park and recreation agencies have not, in the past, been very successful in this area. Earlier research by NRPA on CETA, for example, discovered that only about ten percent of the participants in recreation and park-sponsored programs received the requisite education opportunities. This, too, emphasizes the need to develop a program whereby resource managers and educators, broadly defined, have authority to develop work/education programs appropriate to participant needs.

"Close to Home" Resources

The President's Commission discovered, or rediscovered, that most Americans most frequently use recreation resources and programs 'close to home.' From many sources we determined this to mean fifteen minutes by foot or bicycle, or ten miles by car or transit. This defines, too, where the proposed Corps could likely make its most important contributions in terms of resource conservation and development. It also suggests that participating federal and state entities should make special efforts to involve regional, county and municipal recreation

and park systems. Further, experience generally shows that program participants from an urban setting are less inclined to participate in programs which take them too far from their geographic and cultural roots. This suggests that more "close to home" non-resident programs, rather than resident opportunities, or combinations of resident- non-resident experiences should be encouraged.

Extending Public Values

The legislation proposes what should typify most proposals for public investment: it combines multiple public goals. The American public's vast capacity to consume or use resources must increasingly be balanced with the restoration of these resources. Concurrently, there is a high public value in training and educating those young persons without who early investments, might ultimately require even greater public costs.

Partnerships

It is easy to use this term, and it is often misused. We believe, however, that the proposed legislation has the potential to stimulate a wide range of public-public and public-private partnerships. We envision, for example, that state natural resource and human resource agencies can create processes to effectively address mutual goals and needs: that opportunities for cities and state governments to cooperate on project planning and management will occur: that not-for-profit and for profit entities will be enlisted early in the program--as sources of skills, ideas and, in some circumstances, project sites. Under present public budgetary circumstances it is unlikely that a large number of enrollees will ultimately find public employment. Thus, it is imperative that early involvement with the private sector occur at the state and local levels.

We mentioned at the outset the desirability from our perspective to conceptually define the program beyond the reference to conserving physical resources. Increasingly, there is an interest in and a need for "service" functions. Work involving a wide range of recreation visitor services, for example, could provide experiences equal to or perhaps better than other forms of work. This idea should be legislatively addressed in Sec. 2. b. PURPOSE.

We conclude, Mr. Chairman, with a reference to the Job Training Partnership Act, and its potential for supporting activities and goals allied to those proposed in H.R. 18. It is our understanding that very significant amounts of available JTPA funds remain unobligated annually. Further, some analysts suggest that the "youth" training aspects of JTPA are presently far from fully utilized. This suggests to us an area which the Subcommittee might wish to quickly examine to determine if further congressional guidance or authority is needed to pursue conservation and associated goals.

This concludes my prepared remarks.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Tindall.
With that, we turn to Mr. Yzaguirre.

STATEMENT OF RAUL YZAGUIRRE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA, REPRESENTING THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT CENTER, ACCOMPANIED BY, JOANNA LENNON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, EAST BAY CONSERVATION CORPS, OAKLAND, CA

Mr. YZAGUIRRE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to summarize my statement and ask that the entire statement be entered into the record.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let the Chair announce at this time that all the statements will be entered in their entirety into the record. You have the privilege to summarize.

Mr. YZAGUIRRE. Thank you.

My name is Raul Yzaguirre. I am President of the National Council of La Raza, and I am also a member of the Board of Directors of the Human Environment Center. I am presenting my testimony today on behalf of both organizations.

Also here with me today, to my extreme right, is Joanna Lennon. She is the Executive Director of the East Bay Conservation Corps, and also a member of the Board of the Human Environment Center. She is also the past president of the Association of Conservation Corps around the country. She is here representing Peg Rosenberry, the Executive Director of the Center.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental fact is that we are talking about a piece of legislation, and an idea, that has been proven to work. This is not a harebrained scheme. This is not a new idea. This is not an unproven idea. We have had many years of experience with this concept. It has been tried in many States, and we know that it works. It works in all the ways that have been enunciated by previous speakers and previous presenters. Therefore, it is an idea that needs Federal support. It needs Federal—like we say in Spanish, "appoyo."

The National Council of La Raza is one of the major Hispanic organizations that supports this legislation. We think that H.R. 18 is a positive response to the deterioration of America's economic, social and natural systems. I don't have to tell you the statistics, Mr. Chairman, about unemployment in the Hispanic community, but in youth in some areas it's over 35 percent. About half of all Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth in this country do not finish high school, and this program can provide those alternatives to gangs and to violence and to other forms of social discord.

The Human Environment Center is a very special organization because what it tries to do is to wed two very different movements that, at times, have been at odds with each other, the movement of minorities, like Hispanics and blacks, with the environmental movement. We think it's been a good marriage, and we've learned, I think, a great deal from that. It has led us to work together on very common projects, such as the conservation corps.

Attached to my testimony—and I would very much urge you to look at it—are profiles of conservation corps around the country. We think that that document shows that we're talking about a very popular program that has received attention and support from

a wide variety of sources, from state governments, from local governments, from corporations, from communities, so we're pleased at the support that this program has enlisted in the American people.

I've had the personal privilege of meeting a lot of the leaders of the existing programs, and I've been profoundly impressed by the selfless human and professional commitment that they exhibit. Corps programs seem inherently to attract highly practical idealists, people who know how to get things done, who can do these things on a shoestring budget, and who know how to scrounge up project supplies, in-kind assistance, and how to enlist participation and backing from the various agencies. They know how to instill discipline. They know how to work with youth. They know how to get things done.

Last year we had a conference in San Francisco where we had about 60 corps members from programs across the country, and they worked on projects at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. They presented their vision for the conservation corps and service corps to many of us. Their presentation on that final day of the program put the rest of us to shame. They talked about the programs that they were involved in. They said something that stuck in my mind, that they "recognize the spirit that youth service can generate. We"—meaning them—"need the help of administrators and legislators to channel this spirit and turn our ideas into functioning programs. We challenge you to act on our proposals and use the strength and integrity of young people, use this spirit of youth service to draw our Nation together and do something." That's a very, very powerful statement from people who have been involved in the program.

Let me conclude by saying that I think it is time that the Federal Government joined the states and local governments in accepting the challenge from young people. Clearly, our young people, Hispanic, black, white and others, are calling on us to help them shape the future. So please provide the national encouragement and the modest funding of H.R. 18 to initiate Federal, state and local corps that will engage the kind of leadership I have described in helping jobless youth to help themselves.

Thank you for this opportunity to present my testimony.

[The prepared statement of Raul Yzaguirre follows:]

Human Environment Center

810-18th Street, N.W. · Washington, D.C. 20006 · 202/393-5550

Statement of Raul Yzaguirre
President, National Council of La Raza
and Board Member,
Human Environment Center,
Before the House
Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities
Concerning **H.R. 18, The American Conservation Corps**

May 21, 1987

Mr. Chairman, I am Raul Yzaguirre, President of the National Council of La Raza and a member of the Board of Directors of the Human Environment Center. I speak today for both of those organizations, which are based here in Washington, and I thank you very much for this opportunity to testify. I am here today with Joanna Lennon, Executive Director of the East Bay Conservation Corps and another board member of the Human Environment Center. She is here for Peg Rosenberry, Executive Director of the Center, who cannot be here.

The fundamental fact about the American Conservation Corps is that we know it will work! Many of us have asked Congress to at least try new approaches to solving our youth unemployment problems and meeting our conservation and resource management needs. But today we aren't even asking for new approaches. What we seek is national recognition, through passage of the American Conservation Corps bill, of the promise upon which thousands of young Americans at risk have already delivered. Small conservation corps programs now in place allow jobless youth to prove their own worth in community service, and provide services and work for the states and localities that more than pay for the program. The American Conservation Corps bill will give impetus to many more programs. It will help jobless, often alienated, young men and women gain work experience and the simple personal skills and self respect needed to enter wider job markets. Such first opportunities are critically important.

The National Council of La Raza is one of the major national organizations representing the Hispanic community in the United States. The Council backs H.R. 18 as one positive response to deterioration in America's economic social and natural systems. The youth unemployment rate remains stuck near 18% despite some gains for the total population. For Hispanic youth in major urban areas it is over 35%. About half of all Puerto Rican and Mexican-Americans drop out of high school. We need to provide opportunities for them to do meaningful work and to re-enter the mainstream of society and we need those opportunities now.

The Human Environment Center was established to identify common goals of environmental and social equity organizations and promote joint activities between the two movements to reach those goals. It's major current activity is to serve as a technical assistance organization and information clearinghouse for the existing state and local corps programs which operate across the country. The Center has undertaken its conservation and service corps activities because it strongly believes that youth corps programs provide innovative ways for federal, state and local communities to provide employment and development opportunities for disadvantaged youth while meeting local needs for facility rehabilitation and conservation work.

Attached to my testimony are the Center's profiles of the existing corps programs now serving communities and states across the country. Most of them have been launched since the 1981 budget-slashing that terminated federal program aid. While the corps movement is growing, the existing network is under-funded and grossly inadequate for meeting the demands of both the work to be done and the youth to be employed. We could pile high on this table the data from several years of corps surveys, analyses and conferences, to document our case today but it has all been made available to your staff. More important, I think, is to try to convey to you the caring for this country, the desire to make America right for all its people, that is bound up in the new youth corps movement. The American Conservation Corps bill is needed to provide a federal partner to these state and local efforts.

I have met many leaders of existing programs and have been profoundly impressed by the selfless human and professional commitment they exhibit. Corps programs seem inherently to attract highly-practical idealists, people who know how to get things done on shoestring budgets, who know how to scrounge up projects, supplies and in-kind assistance and how to enlist participation and backing from diverse agencies, businesses, philanthropies and interest groups. And they know how to instill discipline, to teach and to inspire and above all, they care about youth and the land. ACC will build on the successful foundation they have already laid.

Last year at our national conference in San Francisco about 60 corpsmembers from programs across the country gathered to work together on projects in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and to present their vision for the conservation and service corps programs to their elders. Their presentation on the final day of the program put the rest of us to shame. In addition to presenting presenting six very well thought out plans for future corps activities, including a national weatherization program for the homes of the needy, they challenged us as administrators to "recognize the spirit that youth service can generate. We need the help of administrators and legislators to channel this spirit and turn our ideas into functioning programs. We challenge you to act on our proposals and use the strength and integrity of young people, use this spirit of youth service to draw our nation together and do something."

I think it is time that the federal government joined the states and local governments in accepting that challenge. Clearly, our young people, Hispanic, black, white, and others, are calling on us to help them shape the future. So, please provide the national encouragement and the modest funding of H.R. 18 to initiate federal, state and local corps that will engage the kind of leadership I have described in helping jobless youth to help themselves. Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you.

REPRINT

HECNEWS

May 1986

Corpsmembers Demonstrate Their Skills.... ....and Show Their Vision

The 1986 conference, co-sponsored by the Human Environment Center and the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, marked the first time corpsmembers had been included in a national meeting. Looking back, it is hard to imagine a service and conservation corps gathering in which they would not be involved. The inclusion of 56 corpsmembers from programs throughout the U.S. marked a turning point in the service and conservation corps movement and underscored the vigor of the grassroots growth of the movement.

Corpsmembers hard at work at the 1986 National Conference

From every corner of the country and every type of corps they came, worked and showed their vision under the able leadership of Cisco Hunter from the California Conservation Corps, Bill Gorgas from the East Bay Conservation Corps and John Oubre from the San Francisco Conservation Corps. The four-day corpsmember conference, which at some points intersected with the larger conference at Fort Mason, culminated in two events: the work project and the corpsmember presentation made to the main conference on the closing day.

The corpsmember work project demonstrated the visible, productive outcome of conservation and service work -- what young people can do for this country given the opportunity. Corpsmembers were divided into three groups and assigned to projects on the Fort Mason grounds at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. They planted a 200-foot swath of greenery along Laguna Road, installed a new watering system for the park garden and built wooden benches on the central field. A plaque was placed on one of the benches that reads "Service and cooperation, National Corpsmember Conference, 1986."

When the corpsmembers weren't working or attending the main conference, they deliberated on what they wanted for the movement, what course of action they would recommend for the next decade. Many members wanted to stress environmental work; others were more interested in helping the needy, eradicating illiteracy and increasing the awareness of international conflict. By Thursday morning they

Human Environment Center ■ 810 Eighteenth Street, NW ■ Suite 507 ■ Washington, DC 20006 ■ (202) 393-5550

THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT CENTER serves and cultivates common aims of the environmental and social equity movements. The Center promotes racial integration in the environmental and natural resource professions, improvement of urban environments and — the major focus of current work — expansion of youth conservation and service corps programs.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
David Burwell, *Chair*
Dr. Shirley Malcom, *Vice Chair*
Stewart Brandborg, *Secretary*
Leonard Simon, *Treasurer*
Thomas Bethell
Pablo Eisenberg
Brock Evans
Suzan Harjo
William Hoskins
Raul Yzaguirre

STAFF
Jill Diskan, *Executive Director*
Margaret Rosenberry, *Project Director*
Leslie Wilkoff, *Executive Assistant*

agreed on a set of six recommendations which were delivered to the main conference by Lee Traeger, 25, from the Wisconsin Conservation Corps and Wendy Whitcomb, 21, from the California Conservation Corps:

- A national weatherization plan for the homes of the needy.
- The planting of 250,000 trees in urban areas on a common day throughout the country.
- A national wildlife management program to relocate, restock and preserve wildlife.

continued on page 6

- An environmental awareness program that would not only make the conservation corps more visible, but would also foster greater public concern about environmental issues.
- An education companionship program with the elderly for each corps.
- A mandatory education/development program within each corps for the corpsmembers themselves.

Lee Traeger closed the presentation with an appeal to the leaders and administrators of corps programs to "draw the nation together and do something."

Lee Traeger, Wisconsin Conservation Corps and Wendy Whitcomb, California Conservation Corps, addressed the conference on behalf of the nation's corpsmembers.

Photo by Bill Diskan, Wisconsin Conservation Corps

Corpsmembers working together at the conference demonstrated, if nothing else, their vast potential. John Oubre said, "I want to be with people who harness themselves." Through all the hard work and strict rules, the educational requirements and the low pay, the responsibility and leadership training, that is what young people learn in the corps and what they demonstrated to us at the conference.

[illegible] Youth Policy Institute

This conference is the beginning, a recognition of the spirit that youth service can generate. But it doesn't end here. We need the help of administrators and legislators to channel this spirit and turn your ideas into functioning programs. We challenge you to act on our proposals and use the strength and integrity of young people, use this spirit of youth service to draw our nation together and do something.

From the Corpsmember Presentation by:

Lee Traeger, Wisconsin
Wendy Whitcomb, California

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Yzaguirre.
With that, we go to Mr. Basl.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BASL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SERVICE AND CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. BASL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Bill Basl. I am employed by the State of Washington and work for the Washington State Employment Security Department. I serve as the Director of the Washington Youth Employment Exchange, and in that capacity I am the Director of the Washington Service Corps and overall coordinator of our Washington Conservation Corps.

Today, before the subcommittee, I am providing testimony as the President of the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps.

One of our major goals of our Association is to foster the creation and development of corps programs throughout the country. As other witnesses have stated, we have, at this point in time, 40 State and local conservation and service corps programs, enrolling 50,000 young adults annually.

Just last week, a week ago today, I was at the State capitol building in Salem, Oregon, where Governor Goldschmidt declared last Thursday as Oregon Youth Conservation Corps Day. The state of Oregon is in the process of creating a state conservation corps program, and I think legislation like the legislation that we're considering here today is the impetus they need to get their program enacted.

On behalf of our National Association I'd like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding these hearings today.

At this time I would like to call your attention to some corps members and staff from the Montgomery County Conservation Corps who are over to my right, under Director Debbie Shepard, and individuals from the Maryland Conservation Corps who are back to my left. You've already been introduced to Joanna Lennon, Director of East Bay Conservation Corps, Oakland, California. These individuals are here today to show their support on what local corps programs can do around the country and to encourage passage of the American Conservation Corps Act.

Since 1983 there has been a tremendous increase in the number of corps programs that we have seen throughout the country. I think one reason for that increase is because local officials have had to come to grips with a rising unemployment rate in their jurisdictions. I know in our home State in 1983, we were experiencing unemployment rates in some of our rural counties that bordered on 30 to 40 percent, and that was the reported unemployment rate, which we know is a lot less than the real unemployment rate.

The corps efforts around the country are supported with local and State and corporate funds, ranging from the California Conservation Corps in your home State, supported with a $50 million budget, to the Maine Conservation Corps on the East Coast that is supported with $250,000.

In addition to the conservation corps movement there is another movement around the country which is developing, which is a corps movement in the human service area. In New York City we have a city volunteer corps that works on human service projects, and in my own State of Washington we have a Washington Service Corps that works on human service projects.

Barry Tindall just reported to you in his testimony on the report of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors, which called for the creation of a conservation corps program and indicated the tremendous backlog of work that these corps programs can do.

I'd like to point out that a recent study that was done by Richard Danzig and Peter Szanton estimated that, on a conservative basis, there could be created 138,000 year-round corps-type positions, working on projects ranging from soil and water conservation to parks and recreation development, to energy conservation, to fish and wildlife habitat improvement, to forestry, etc.

But I think most importantly, in every corner of the country we have young people, young adults, who are stepping up and are willing to serve in these programs if only given the opportunity to serve.

Corps programs work. There is no question in my mind that they work. They provide young adults a positive means to channel their idealism and interest into an activity that has a lasting impact on our environment.

Corps programs provide needed employment and training opportunities to participants. But I think the corps programs as we see them are most known because of the sense of pride in major projects that the conservation corps programs have developed all over the country. Locally, in the State of Maryland, the Maryland Conservation Corps has worked on a variety of projects that will help restore the water quality of Chesapeake Bay. The corps was involved in thousands of hours of backbreaking labor putting gabions along streams to check stream bank erosion, projects that probably very few people see but that all of us benefit from.

The Montgomery County Conservation Corps and the Maryland Conservation Corps worked on a joint project a couple of years ago on a dedicated land right-of-way on a floodplain. This area was overgrown by underbrush and trees and debris, and a seven-year-old boy was stabbed there a couple of years ago. Maryland Conservation Corps and the Montgomery Conservation Corps came together, cleared the debris and stabilized the stream bank.

I think, however, as Representative Sikorski has talked about, the conservation corps, I think, provides another major benefit, and that is that it provides a young adult a sense of community service, a respect for the environment, and an overall realization of what civic responsibility is all about. Corps programs have proved themselves at the local level, and we need a Federal partner to help cement that relationship.

Across the country, local corps programs rely on a minimum of $114 million of local funds that had been supported by state legislators, corporations, private nonprofit organizations, foundations, etc.

The bill before us today, H.R. 18, would have a matching requirement in that bill, and that matching requirement, I think, is im-

portant because that would not mean that money would just be handed out. States and localities would have to come up with a match to prove a good faith effort, that they really want these programs. And I think that's an important part of this legislation.

I think that the Federal legislation, however, will help stimulate new programs in other parts of the country and help promote access and opportunity for young adults who don't have that opportunity in other parts of the country right now to participate in the corps programs.

In my home State of Washington we have just this year enjoyed complete legislative support for our programs. Both programs were reauthorized in the State Legislature without one dissenting vote. I think that gives testimony that a bill that began in a Republican administration and that is now in a Democratic administration can survive, and it's a good bipartisan activity.

I thank you today for the opportunity to present my testimony and encourage passage of the legislation.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of William C. Basl follows:]

Statement of William C. Basl Before The
House Subcommittee On Employment Opportunities
Concerning The American Conservation Corps H.R. 18
May 21, 1987

Good Morning Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. My name is Bill Basl. I am employed by the State of Washington and work for the Employment Security Department. I serve as the Director of the Washington Youth Employment Exchange and in that capacity I administer the Washington Service Corps and serve as coordinator of the Washington Conservation Corps which operates in six state resource conservation agencies. I am providing testimony today as President of the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps (NASCC). One of the major goals of our association is to foster the creation and development of corps programs throughout the country. To date more than forty state and local conservation and service corps programs enrolling fifty thousand young adults annually are operating either year-round or summer programs.

On behalf of our national association I want to extend our appreciation to you for holding hearings on H.R. 18. It takes a great deal of effort and commitment to properly plan and develop legislation that will lead to a sound return on your investment of time and resources. Our association members and our staff at the Human Environment Center in Washington, D.C., stand ready to help provide the support to turn concept into reality.

At this time I would like to call your attention to corpsmembers and staff from the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps, the Montgomery County Conservation Corps, representatives of the Maryland Conservation Corps, a corpsmember from the Wisconsin Conservation Corps, the Director of the East Bay Conservation Corps, and a Vice President of the Shell Oil Corporation who is Chairman of the Board of the Texas Conservation Corps. These programs are here today to show their support and interest in the programs they represent and also encourage passage of the ACC.

Since 1983 we have observed an ever increased level of Corps activity through out the country. One reason for this level of interest has been the local realization that efforts had to be taken to address the 2.9 million youth, ages 16-24, who are unemployed. Our state and local programs are the results of initiatives by state legislatures, Governors, local government officials, and private corporations. These efforts range in scope of funding from the California Conservation Corps supported with a $50 million budget to the Maine Conservation Corp funded at $225,000. In addition, the corps movement has also been organized around human service issues with the City Volunteer corps in New York and the Washington State Service Corps placing young adults in human service projects which address unmet community needs. A report, just recently issued by President Reagan's Commission on Americans Outdoors, called for the creation of outdoor corps programs. Part of this recommendation was in response to the tremendous backlog on conservation work. Specifically the report outlined projects that should be undertaken at close to home urban sites and at locations that will protect and enhance federal, state, and local lands and waters.

A recent study completed by Richard Danzig and Peter Szanton estimates that conservatively 138,000 year-round positions would be available for young people on a variety of projects including, soil and water conservation, parks and recreation development, energy conservation, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, and forestry. From every corner of our country, corps programs are developing and young adults are stepping up and are willing to serve.

Corps programs work! They provide a young adult with a positive means to channel interest and idealism into an activity that will have a lasting impact on the environment. Corps programs provide needed education and training opportunities to participants, many of

whom, are in desperate need of these resources. These experiences can and do prepare participants for the world of work. But, corps activities are identified by the major projects that are completed with sweat and the sense of pride embodied in the enrollees of our programs. Locally, the Maryland Conservation Corps has worked on a variety of projects that will help restore the quality of the Chesapeake Bay. The corps was involved in major stream bank control projects to check stream erosion. They constructed thousands of feet of gabions, grueling work done in the hottest parts of the summer. Corps programs are cost effective. Although methods of calculating benefits might vary, we know that our Washington Conservation Corps during the last year produced $1.93 worth of work for each dollar appropriated. Most importantly, though, corps programs provide young adults with a sense of belonging, an understanding of community service, a respect for the environment, and an overall realization of civic responsibility. Corps programs have proven themselves on the local level. A federal partner to these successful initiatives will cement a long awaited relationship.

In this spirit of partnership, the American Conservation Corps strongly builds on the funding support already leveraged at the local level. At a minimum, $114.0 million of local, private, and state funds are annually allocated to our existing corps programs. It is testimony to their success that these non-federal resources have been prioritized to benefit these program approaches. The matching requirement contained in the bill would help insure continued local commitment while stimulating states to initiate a corps program. This legislation will provide support for the local jurisdictions who can also benefit from the program. Most importantly, federal legislation will help improve access and opportunity for young adults to participate in this program throughout our country. We assume that existing programs serving some of the youth in this age group but not all age groups prescribe in the bill, will be eligible for funding. State and local programs stand with you and are ready to do their part.

In the state of Washington, the Washington Service Corps and Washington Conservation Corps have enjoyed wide if not unanimous support in the state legislative process. Both programs began four years ago and have been reauthorized for eight additional years. The reauthorization bills passed the state legislature without a negative vote. Other state and local programs can provide similar examples of what support funding bodies have given to their programs.

The time has come to have an American Conservation Corps. This initiative like the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's will prove to have a lasting positive impact on the environment and the people called to serve in these programs.

I appreciate the opportunity to come before you today and share the experiences of the local Corps movement in our country.

Thank you.

CONSERVATION AND SERVICE CORPS PROFILES

November, 1986

There has been a remarkable emergence of state, local and nonprofit youth conservation and service corps since the 1981 termination of most such Federal programs. Data here show $124 million now spent annually for these operations in the U.S. — $94 million for 19 programs in 16 states; $19.5 million for 21 local and non-profit corps; and $10 million by Federal agencies (vs. a Federal $260 million before 1981).

These programs vary in design and function but they typically depend upon an array of conservation, youth and employment interests for statewide and/or local support. All serve conservation and/or human needs, and most are seriously underfunded. The funding levels shown here are not necessarily comparable from corps to corps because of variations in program design and accounting. The Human Environment Center is glad to provide details on the structure and functions of each corps.

This information has been gathered from corps managers and operators. Corrections and additions are currently invited. — **Human Environment Center, 810 18th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006, 202/393-5930.**

Year-Round Corps

State Programs

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
Alaska Conservation Corps[1] Pete Martin, Director Alaska Conservation Corps Box 5001 Anchorage, AK 99510 907/762-4512	$150,000	Ages 18-24 # 95	State appropriation	Administered by and operates in Alaska State Parks	
California Conservation Corps Rod Diehle, Director California Conservation Corps 1530 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95814 916/445-0307	$44 million	Ages 18-23 # 2,000	State appropriation	Administered as a division of the California Resources Agency. Contracts with federal, state and local government agencies and non-profit organizations for work.	Operates career development and conservation awareness programs. New corpsmembers attend a 2-week training academy before assignment to 12 centers. 17 residential and 15 non-residential centers.
Connecticut Conservation Corps Richard Crouch Division of Conservation & Preservation Department of Environmental Protection Hartford, CT 06106 203/566-5020	$681,000	Ages 18-20 # 80	State appropriation	Administered by the Department of Environmental Protection. Operates in state parks and forests.	
Illinois Conservation Corps[2] Stephen Gorniak, Administrator Illinois Conservation Corps 405 East Washington Street Springfield, IL 62706 217/782-1801	$1,400,000	Ages 16-23 # 740	State appropriation	Administered as a unit of the Illinois Department of Conservation. Operates in state parks, conservation areas, forests and natural areas.	The Corps has two components: 1. A year-round program for young adults, 18-25 years of age. 2. A summer program for youth, 16-18 years of age.

YEAR-ROUND CORPS: State Programs *(continued)*

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
Iowa Conservation Corps JoAnn Callison Department of Economic Development 200 E. Grand Avenue Des Moines, IA 50319 515/281-3927	$1,465,000 (excludes local match of 15% or more)	Ages: 16-19 # 3,000	State appropriation and local match	Administered by Iowa Department of Economic Development. Funds are subgranted to school districts, conservation boards and community groups for community improvement projects (volunteer program), human service projects (in-school service corps) and conservation projects (Young Adult Conservation Corps).	The Corps has three components. 1. Volunteer program: State pays for supplies, materials and technical assistance for community improvement projects. Local community groups do the project with volunteer youth. 2. In-school Service Corps: Operated by school districts. Disadvantaged students work 10 hours/week after school on private projects. 3. Young Adult Conservation Corps: Provides conservation-related jobs for 19-24 year olds.
Michigan Civilian Conservation Corps Timothy Ervin, Director Michigan Conservation Corps Department of Natural Resources P.O. Box 30028 Lansing, MI 48909 517/334-6065	$5.6 million	Ages: 18-25 # 500	State appropriation	Administered by the Department of Natural Resources. Operates on public land.	Corpsmembers must be on Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) or general assistance when hired.
Minnesota Conservation Corps* Larry Fenness, Acting Director Office of Youth Programs Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road St. Paul, MN 55155-4004 612/296-2144	$746,500	Ages: 18-26 # 60	State appropriation	Administered by the Department of Natural Resources. Operates on state-owned land.	
New Jersey Youth Corps Ken Butko, Administrator New Jersey Youth Corps Rm. 4A - New Jersey Department of Community Affairs CN-800 363 West State Street Trenton, NJ 08625 609/984-6666	$2.8 million	Ages: 16-25 # 1000	State appropriation	Administered jointly by the Department of Community Affairs and Department of Education with corps units contracted to non-profit, private organizations and state, county and municipal agencies.	Serves "out of school" youth with heavy emphasis on work maturity skills, career and personal counseling and acquiring basic education skills for completion of secondary education. Developing "post-corps" assistance linkages.
Ohio Conservation Corps Ed Hanson, Chief Ohio Division of Civilian Conservation 1889 Fountain Square, Bldg. F-2 Columbus, OH 43224 614/265-6423	$5.7 million	Ages: 16-23 # 380	State appropriation	Administered by the Division of Civilian Conservation in the Department of Natural Resources. Operates on public and private lands. Works for state, county and local governments.	Operates three residential camps with a fourth under construction. Voluntary GED and remedial education programs offered to corpsmembers, primarily at the residential camps.
Pennsylvania Conservation Corps Ralph Romano, Director Office of Program Planning & Development Department of Environmental Resources P.O. Box 1467 Harrisburg, PA 17120 717/787-2316	$6.75 million	Ages: 18-25 # 600-800	State appropriation	Administered by the Department of Environmental Resources. Operates on public land or private land with documented public benefit. State agencies and local government can submit project proposals to the DER.	Corpsmembers must be economically disadvantaged.
Texas Conservation Corps Doug Duke, Director Texas Conservation Corps Foundation, Inc. P.O. Box 795 Austin, TX 78767 512/463-2879	$1,582,000	Ages: 18-21 # 300	JTPA, public, private partnership and fees for services	Operates in private, non-profit corporation working on state parks, wildlife refuges, barrier islands, on city, state and county lands.	Program has historic preservation project on the Battleship Texas.

Wisconsin Conservation Corps William Brokken, Director Wisconsin Conservation Corps 30 W. Mifflin, #400 Madison, WI 53703 608/266-7130	$2.1 million	Ages 18-25 # 250	State appropriation	Administered by a governor appointed citizen policy board as an independent state agency attached to the Department of Administration for fiscal and budgetary purposes. Operates on public land and private land with public access or where significant public benefits will result.	Public and non-profit agencies submit proposals to receive corps services.
Washington Conservation Corps William Bird, Director Washington Youth Employment Exchange Washington Conservation Corps Employment Security Department 212 Maple Park MS EG-11 Olympia, WA 98504-5311 206/438-4072	$2.5 million	Ages 18-25 # 500	State appropriation	Administered at six state conservation agencies and coordinated by the Department of Employment Security. Operates on public lands.	
Washington Service Corps William Bird, Director Washington Youth Employment Exchange Washington Service Corps Employment Security Department 212 Maple Park MS EG-11 Olympia, WA 98504-5311 206/438-4072	$1.1 million (plus $300,000 cash contribution from sponsoring agencies)	Ages 18-25 # 175	State appropriation	Administered by the Department of Employment Security.	Works on projects serving the handicapped, promoting tourism, assisting refugees, stimulating economic development and assisting the elderly.

Local and Regional Programs

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
A Team Raymond Berthier, Coordinator 120 N. Langley Road - Suite 200 Glen Burnie, MD 21061 301/761-5010	$150,000 400,000	Ages 18-24 # 25	JTPA and Anne Arundel County Office of Community Development	Administered by the Anne Arundel County Office of Manpower. Provides services for community and non-profit organizations and federal, county and city governmental agencies.	Three-month program for low income youth with focus on getting participants into work force. Provides classroom and on the job skills training.
City Volunteer Corps Gail Kong, Director National Service Corporation 842 Broadway New York, NY 10003 212/475-6464	$10 million	Ages 17-30 # 800	City of New York with some private funding	Administered as a private, non-profit organization. Work sponsors are city agencies and non-profit organizations.	Corpsmembers receive $81 a week for expenses and qualify for a $2,500 cash readjustment or $5,000 scholarship bonus after one year of service.
Conservation Corps of Central Virginia Maria Long YDS, Inc. Conservation Corps of Central Virginia 1024 Park Avenue P.O. Box 2416 Lynchburg, VA 24501 804/846-2333	$120,000	Ages 16-21 # 6-12	JTPA and in-kind from YDS, Inc.	Administered by Youth Adult Development Services (YDS), a private, non-profit organization. Contracts with state and municipal agencies and other non-profit organizations.	One day per week a spent on education and corpsmember development.
Dutchess County Youth Community Service Corps Luis Gerard Acosta, Director Youth Resource Development Corporation 50 Delafield Street Poughkeepsie, NY 12601 914/473-5005	$414,000	Ages 16-21 # 70	JTPA, New York State Department of Labor and some foundation support for supplies and uniforms	Administered by the Youth Resource Development Corporation, a private, non-profit organization. Crews work on projects for county and state parks, public and community agencies.	Employs economically disadvantaged, high school drop-outs. Operates a 5-day work week with a half day of school and half day of work. Work and classroom components are competency based.

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
East Bay Conservation Corps* Jeanne Lennon, Executive Director East Bay Conservation Corps 1021 3rd Street Oakland, CA 94607 415/272-0222	$1.4 million	Ages 17-24 # 85	Public agency funds, foundation grants and fees-for-services	Administered as a private, non-profit corporation. Contracts for work with federal, state and local agencies.	Operates a 4-day work week with a 6th unpaid, mandatory education day.
Greater Atlanta Conservation Corps Karen Smith Greater Atlanta Conservation Corps 250 Georgia Avenue Suite 206 Atlanta, GA 30312 404/688-7602	$191,000	Ages 16-23 # 70-76	Public agency funds, foundation grants, private industry councils, corporate contributions and fees-for-services	Administered as a non-profit corporation with a board of directors co-chaired by the Chairman of Fulton County and the Mayor of Atlanta. Contracts for work on public lands and for non-profit organizations.	Operates a 4-day work week with a 6th unpaid day of time continuing education, career development and life-coping skills. Demonstration phase July-December 1986.
Los Angeles Conservation Corps Martin Theuerkauf Los Angeles Conservation Corps P.O. Box 15044 Los Angeles, CA 90015 213/749-1601	$780,000	Ages 16-23 # 70	State and private agencies, fees-for-services	Administered as a non-profit organization. Operates on public lands.	Operates a 4-day work week with a 6th unpaid, mandatory education day.
Marin Conservation Corps* Diane Wurzbach, Director Marin Conservation Corps Box 89 San Rafael, CA 94915 415/454-8554	$1.49 million	Ages 18-26 # 48	Fees-for-services, foundation grants	Administered as a private, non-profit corporation. Contracts for work with federal, state and local agencies.	Operates a 4-day work week with a 6th (30th paid), mandatory education day.
Montgomery County Conservation Corps* Deborah Shepard, Director Montgomery County Conservation Corps 600 E. Gude Drive Rockville, MD 20850 301/294-8720	$307,800	Ages 17-22 # 20	County appropriation	Administered by Montgomery College. Operates on public lands in watersheds of the Potomac, Patuxent and Anacostia Rivers.	Sponsors a Carpentry Training program funded by JTPA and the Montgomery County Private Industry Council.
Sacramento Local Conservation Corps Ron Espinosa, Executive Director Sacramento Local Conservation Corps c/o Cosumnes River College 8401 Center Parkway Sacramento, CA 95823 916/423-3139	$720,000	Ages 18-23 # 60-70	75% state appropriation via California Conservation Corps. 25% fees-for-services, donations, grants	Administered as a private, non-profit corporation with all work done for government entities or other non-profit organizations.	Operates a 4-day work week with a 6th unpaid education day.
San Francisco Conservation Corps* Robert Burkhardt, Director San Francisco Conservation Corps Fort Mason, Bldg. 111 San Francisco, CA 94123 415/928-7322	$1.9 million	Ages 18-23 # 100	Government projects, philanthropy, fees-for-services	Administered as a private, non-profit organization. Contracts for work on public land.	Operates a 4-day work week with a 6th unpaid, mandatory education day.
Stanley House Richard Kowan, Director Stanley House R.D. #1 - Box 292 Chester, VT 05739 802/293-5121	$175,000	Ages 14-19 # 24-36	School tuitions, philanthropy and JTPA	Administered by a non-profit organization.	Operates natural resource demonstration project and work/training program for in-school, disadvantaged Vermont youth.
Youth Energy Corps Howard Fuchett, Executive Director Corporation for Youth Energy Corps 780 E. 160th Street Bronx, NY 10456 212/402-3300	$900,000	Ages 16-18 # 30-48	Funded by foundations, fees-for-services, government contracts and grants.	Administered by the Corporation for Youth Energy Corps. Sponsored by the Argus Community, a community based organization.	Work/training program for disadvantaged youth. Provides basic rehabilitation for low income housing. Provides GED instruction.

*These programs add more corpsmembers during the summer months, typically using Title II (B) Job Training Partnership Act funds or state summer employment resources.

Summer Corps

State Programs

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
Maine Conservation Corps Donna Doiron, Director Maine Conservation Corps State House Station 22 Augusta, ME 04333 207/289-2211	$225,000	Ages 16-21 # 100	Combines state funds with local government's federal Summer Youth dollars	Administered by the Department of Conservation. Operates on public land or private land operating for the public good.	Establishing residential work crews.
Maryland Conservation Corps Jonathan Underwood, Director Maryland Conservation Corps Department of Natural Resources 69 Prince George Street Annapolis, MD 21401 301/269-3768	$1.4 million	Ages 16-21 # 900	State appropriation and JTPA	Administered by the Department of Natural Resources. Operates on state, county and private lands.	Projects are restricted to those that restore the Chesapeake Bay.
Michigan Youth Corps Tim Erves Conservation Jobs Programs Department of Natural Resources P.O. Box 30028 Lansing, MI 48909 517/334-6065	$15 million	Ages 15-21 # 12,500	State appropriation	Administered by the Department of Labor. Operates on public lands through the Departments of Natural Resources, Labor, Transportation, Agriculture and Education.	Priority given to older applicants whose heads of households are unemployed.
Pennsylvania Conservation Corps Ralph Romeo, Director Office of Program Planning & Development Department of Environmental Resources P.O. Box 1467 Harrisburg, PA 17120 717/787-2316	$37,000	Ages 15-18 # 18	Foundation grants, private donations which are matched with funds from DER	Administered by the Department of Environmental Resources.	Operates a 4-day work week with a fifth unpaid environmental education day.
Vermont Youth Conservation Corps Thomas L. Hark, Director Vermont Youth Conservation Corps Department of Forests, Parks & Recreation 103 Main Street, 10 South Waterbury, VT 05676 802/244-5115	$425,000	Ages 16-21 # 120	Corporate crew sponsors (50%), state (25% for administration & start-up) and federal JTPA (25%)	Administered by the Department of Forests, Parks & Recreation in cooperation with the Department of Employment & Training, the State of Vermont and the Citizens Council of Employment & Training. Operates on public facilities.	Soon hopes to operate year-round residential centers.

Summer Corps

Local and Regional Programs

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
Anne Arundel County Bay Savers Thomas McGuinn Office of Manpower P.O. Box 1831 - MS 1306 Annapolis, MD 21404 301/224-1319	$100,000	Ages: 16-21 #: 60-90	JTPA Title (II) B	Administered by the County Office of Manpower	Crews are assigned by the county to projects designed to preserve the ecosystem and environmental quality of several watersheds of the Chesapeake Bay
NY State County Programs					
Chautauqua Conservation Corps Kenneth Kopacz, Executive Director Chautauqua Youth Bureau Town Hall Broadway & Union Roads Chautauqua, NY 14227 716/668-3323	$83,000	Ages: 16-18 #: 90	Town appropriation	Administered by the town Youth Bureau. Operates on state and local lands.	
Oswego County Conservation Corps David Warner, Director Oswego County Conservation Corps Oswego County Cooperative Extension Main Street Mexico, NY 13114 315/963-7286	$82,000	Ages: 16-21 #: 64	JTPA and local in-kind	Administered by the Oswego County Cooperative Extension. Operates on state and local lands.	8 crews of 8 members
St. Lawrence County Conservation Corps Mary Ann Ashley, Executive Director St. Lawrence County Youth Department Surrogate Court Building Court & Judson Streets Canton, NY 13617 315/379-2377/9464	$40,000	Ages: 16-21 #: 40	JTPA, New York State Division for Youth, St. Lawrence County and local in-kind.	Jointly administered by the St. Lawrence County Youth Department, St. Lawrence County Forester, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the Office of Economic Development.	Five crews (7-9 corpsmembers) operate on state, county and local lands. Educational component consists of presentations by human service organizations, e.g. Sheriff's Juvenile Aid Division.
Suffolk County Conservation Corps Peter Crisano, Project Director Suffolk County Department of Labor 655 Deerpark Avenue Babylon, NY 11702 516/661-8600	$201,000	Ages: 16-21 #: 168	JTPA and local in-kind	Administered by the Suffolk County Department of Labor. Operates on state and local lands.	
Northwest Youth Corps Arthur Pope, Director Northwest Youth Corps P.O. Box 5345 Eugene, OR 97405 503/746-8653	$225,000	Ages: 16-19 #: 100	Fee-for-service	Administered as a private, non-profit organization operating on public and private lands in summer and fall.	Mandatory daily education and job training component. Residential only.
Sonoma Community Conservation Corps Marie Young, Program Manager Sonoma Community Conservation Corps 9619 Old Redwood Highway Windsor, CA 95492 707/838-6641	$155,000	Ages: 14-21 #: 95	JTPA	Administered by a private, non-profit organization. Operates on public lands and lands administered by private, non-profit organizations.	Operates a special video crew and makes public service announcements for non-profits.

West Philadelphia Improvement Corps George Brewer, Executive Director West Philadelphia Partnership Box 1948 3901 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19104 215/386-5757	$135,000	Ages 9-19 # 112 (includes 20 corpsmembers who work after school)	Private and corporate donations, city job funds, University of Pennsylvania in-kind contributions	Administered by the West Philadelphia Partnership, a private, non-profit organization	Year-round "after-school" program for 75, employees classes in horticulture, landscaping and architecture as extension of summer work projects. Classes taught by University of Pennsylvania students as a community service project. All work and activities are geared toward education and supervised by teachers.

Federal Programs

Program	Annual Budget	Ages/# of Participants	Funding Sources	Administration/Work Sponsors	Comments/Special Features
Youth Conservation Corps NPS - Grover Barham 202/343-2917 FWS - Don Boyd 202/343-4404 FS - Leon Anderson 202/382-1690	$10 million	Ages 15-18 # 6,000	Federal government funds are divided between the National Park Service, Fish & Wildlife Service and the National Forest Service	Each agency administers its own program	Programs operate solely on federal lands within each agency

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Basl.
Mr. Bailin?

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL BAILIN, PRESIDENT, PUBLIC/PRIVATE VENTURES, INC.

Mr. BAILIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Michael Bailin, President of Public/Private Ventures. We are a not-for-profit research and program development firm in Philadelphia that seeks to find solutions to labor market barriers and problems for at-risk kids. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to be here today and to talk to you and to others.

The only amendment to my written testimony is to thank you, which got lopped off at the end of page 3 in an effort to keep it short, but other than that I'm going to try to just skim lightly over some of the things I've said in written testimony, but perhaps highlight some research issues because I think that's one thing I can add here that some of the others are not yet able to do.

I think it's important to say that we, as a major part of our work at Public/Private Ventures over the past five years, have looked very closely at these corps programs. We've looked at eight to ten programs in this country. We've looked at Katimavik, a national service program in Canada. We've looked at CVS, an important program in Great Britain which serves large numbers of kids, particularly at-risk kids.

Our interest in looking at these kinds of programs has been from the perspective of trying to see whether they were appropriate vehicles for dealing with the employment and training problems of at-risk young people. In addition to looking at these various programs we've done a very comprehensive analysis of the large program in your home state over the last four years, which will now finally be completed in a matter of weeks, in which we did a comprehensive analysis of the impact of those programs on kids. Beyond that, we have conducted a number of workshops for planners and operators for youth corps around the country, generally to enable them to discuss policy issues and operational details in advance of the research coming out, because we thought it was important inasmuch as there were a number of new initiatives beginning, and programs don't always wait for the research to be completed.

Finally, we've designed a model urban program for Philadelphia which, we're pleased to say, is likely to get off the ground within a few months. We will test our ability to translate research findings into good operational activities.

Through all of our work, I guess I would summarize by saying that there's an awful lot still to be learned, but we have concluded that youth conservation corps are—as my written testimony said—a constructive, a fiscally-responsible, and an effective way to address two major unmet needs of the Nation, the problems with our public lands and facilities and the large numbers of kids who really need this kind of experience.

I'm going to keep away from discussing the fact that there is enough work to be done. I think that's been established, that there are a number of kids to take advantage of this who can benefit

from it. I believe that's been established, and I think I'd like to focus more on some of the questions that I think Mr. Gunderson was beginning to raise, and that's issues that have to do with whether or not—while this program is expensive, and it is, generally, per person, why this program can be accomplished in a cost-effective and cost-beneficial way, which I think is really the most important way to evaluate youth employment and training programs.

First of all, as a social investment you're going to be concerned about who is served by these programs, and I think that the fact of the matter is that everything that we've done establishes that at-risk kids are attracted to this program in very, very great numbers. In your own program in California, the California Conservation Corps with over 2,000 kids—more than 70 percent of the young people there are at risk, either economically—that is, they are eligible under the JTPA standards—or they have not graduated with a high school degree, so they are lacking that important credential for labor market success.

If you take a look at the New York program, the Texas program about which we heard before, you will find even greater numbers of at-risk kids.

So we know these programs do attract those kinds. In fact, if the committee is really serious about the non-targeting issue, I think the problem is going to be more attracting more advantaged kids. Very few programs have succeeded in bringing in kids who come from better circumstances and who can provide the kind of mix that you need. But while few have succeeded, I want to say that I think it is worth it. I only feel intuitively—we don't have the data to show it—that this kind of blend of different people working together really does have an effect. I think anyone who has seen these programs would believe it. We don't have the data, but I think it is very clear that the political constituency necessary to develop for this and to avoid a program being labeled a "program for losers," all these different kinds of things make very important that we make strong efforts to bring in kids who come from different circumstances and to make this a non-targeted program.

The second point I'd like to make is that in addition to attracting these kids, we've learned from our research that young people who come from disadvantaged circumstances are served at least as well as the other kids. That is to say, while attrition is often high in these programs, there is no more chance that a person from disadvantaged circumstances will fall away from the program prematurely than somebody who comes from different circumstances. So the program does attract, and it does serve, disadvantaged and at-risk populations.

Secondly, and I think maybe more importantly, we get to the issue of benefits. We have, at least in the case of the California Conservation Corps, done the only impact analysis that I know has been done to test whether or not young people who come out of these programs fare any better than a comparison group of kids who are similarly circumstanced, but who do not enter that program. And I think under fairly rigorous research conditions, while we have not established that all kids benefit, we have established that many kids do well economically a year out of the program. And particularly, again, low income, low education, and some mi-

norities in particular benefitted from this program economically as against the comparison group of young people similarly who did not enter that program. So I think we can get important economic impacts out of these programs, and that should be underscored once again.

Lastly, I think, and perhaps as important as the previous point, is the fact that we have established without doubt that the work value to the community of these programs, the work value in and of themselves alone approaches the cost of the program. So even before we get to issues about young people being helped and served, which I believe is critically important—perhaps most important—we can safely say that the community and the public are served already insofar as that the dollar comes back by virtue of work that is accomplished by these young people. And that alone makes the program cost-beneficial. When you add in these other issues of impact on young people, I think you go well beyond the dollar for dollar that comes back. In some of the different ways we tested out work value we came up with virtually no approach that showed that the program was anything less than $0.75 to $1.00 paid for, even before you got to what the effects were with the kids, and I think that by very conservative estimates and trying out all kinds of econometric equations and different approaches, under the most conservative assumptions I would submit that these programs pay for themselves at the point of the work value alone.

I don't want to go on too much longer. I'm particularly pleased by the balance in the Federal role in the way this legislation is written, in the emphasis on state and local programming where, in fact, we've now seen some real successes. I'm particularly pleased at the recognition by the authors of this legislation of the need for education components, the need for credentialling, job guidance, placement information, because one problem that we do have with these programs that we've seen is that that is not sufficiently addressed in most programs, and it needs a lot more attention.

And finally, I think I'm particularly pleased by the reservation of some dollars in this legislation for some further demonstrations, because there still is a lot more to be learned about it and we ought to take the next three years, if we're going to proceed with this, to try to learn as much as we can before opening this thing up much larger.

I won't say much more. I believe it's fairly well written. I would like to speak at length some time about how complex it is to run these programs, and I believe very strongly that if it's going to work—even if this is the right legislation, the writing of the regulations is going to be critical to making this thing go, but I feel very pleased to see the legislation as it's been drafted, and I'm pleased to be here to testify before you today.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Michael A. Bailin follows:]

Testimony by Michael A. Bailin
President of Public/Private Ventures
before the
House Committee on Education and Labor
Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities
* * * * * * *
Hearing on H.R. 18 (The American Conservation Corps)
May 21, 1987

I am Michael A. Bailin, President of Public/Private Ventures, a national, non-profit program development and research organization that seeks solutions for the employment-related problems of youth and young adults.

Since 1983, one of our major areas of concentration has been on the youth conservation and service corps programs that have developed in the past 10 years. We have studied in depth 10 year-round corps in the U.S., Canada and England. We have done a comprehensive analysis of the nation's oldest and largest existing state corps, the California Conservation Corps. We have conducted a dozen workshops for corps planners and operators, in which both policy issues and operational details of corps management have been explored in detail. And we have designed a model urban corps for the City of Philadelphia.

In all this work, we are focussing on a number of major questions about year-round corps: how do they work, whom do they serve, who benefits from corps programs, whether they are good employment and training options and/or good social investments, and whether they teach us anything about the potential of national service. I would be happy to share our findings on some of these issues in more detail with the committee at another time.

In sum, however, I can say that we have concluded that youth corps programming is a constructive, fiscally responsible and effective way to involve young people in conservation, rehabilitation and improvement projects on public properties. We do, therefore, support programs that, like the American Conservation Corps, would enhance the nation's resources and environment while providing youth with work and educational opportunities. Although the 23,000 year-round slots that the proposed ACC legislation would provide falls far short of the enormous need, we feel it is a very good start toward a balanced federal role in aiding the state and local programs now underway and, certainly, an incentive for development of additional state programs.

We support, particularly, provisions in the proposed legislation that provide youth with an opportunity to do useful work in small crews, require the inclusion of an educational component and credentialing capacity, provide for adequate payment and additional incentives, require that high standards of conduct be enforced, and stipulate that job guidance and placement information be provided to corpsmembers.

The presence of these provisions appears particularly appropriate for a program that, though it appears to emphasize the work to be accomplished, presents itself also as an employment and training program that focuses especially on disadvantaged and dropout youth.

We have found that many of the youth who join youth corps are very disadvantaged indeed, and need much more than just work experience. Their academic deficiencies and attitudes toward work need more than cursory attention; their alienation from school means that special education programs must be provided to attract their attendance and attention; and they often need additional services to help them remain in and complete the program, and find their way into the labor market. We are, therefore, pleased to see these needs addressed in the proposed legislation, and note that their implementing regulations will be crucial to the success of this program.

76-011 O - 87 - 3

Based on our investigations of eight corps in the U.S. (including the former federal Young Adult Conservation Corps), the Canadian corps (Katimavik) and the CSV program in Britain, we would predict that the bulk of youth to be attracted to a year-round corps like the ACC would be low-income youth without an adequate high school education or clear employment alternatives. If the ACC wishes to serve a more heterogenous population that includes middle income high school graduates as well as more disadvantaged youth, then special efforts will likely have to be made to attract them. Just declaring that the ACC seeks a diverse group of youth will not achieve the goal. Therefore, I recommend that the framers of the legislation consider including features and incentives that would make the ACC more appealing to a wide range of enrollees. Determined and creative efforts to design and recruit for such a program will be required. To our knowledge, no program has managed much success in this area so far, but there are many possible strategies that have yet to be tried.

Our research has also led us to some other observations that are particularly relevant to the proposed legislation:

First, there is an enormous amount of work to be done on public lands--work that can be done effectively by young people with minimal academic and work skills. Care should be taken, though, to ensure that the projects are set up to provide a constant flow of work and the necessary equipment to get it done--downtime is the villain of which all youth corps beware; that the work is challenging enough to keep the corpsmembers' interest and enhance their skills--routinized maintenance work is another villain; that crew size is kept low enough to enable proper supervision and development of team spirit (optimally eight to 12 members); and that the work is well supervised by crew leaders who are substantially more mature and experienced than the enrollees, and can function as role models and teachers as well as work supervisors.

We are pleased that the proposed legislation goes well beyond providing physical work in rural areas. Our experience with existing urban corps indicates that there is substantial physical work to be done in our city parks and deteriorated public facilities as well as in rural areas. Of particular interest, though, are the urban programs that now include opportunities for corpsmembers to deliver human services. Corpsmembers in San Francisco, the East Bay area and New York city are working effectively in schools, child care centers, facilities for the elderly and disabled, and recreation programs--meeting needs that these institutions would not be able to handle without the corpsmembers' help. The Committee might want to give some thought to encouraging this kind of work as well.

Second, from a cost-benefit perspective, we have found that the 10 year old California Conservation Corps, which is in the same mold as the proposed ACC, at the very least is a break even proposition. (The CCC, to our knowledge, is the only corps whose cost-benefit ratio has been rigorously researched.) Although the results are highly sensitive to the methods used, we found that by most measures, the benefits from the CCC's work alone are sufficient to offset the cost of producing it. And, if you add benefits in terms of increased earnings by corpsmembers in the year after they leave, the benefits from a social perspective at least equal the program's costs.

Our CCC research also disclosed that the program is particularly beneficial for disadvantaged youth--JTPA-eligible corpsmembers had higher post-program earnings than their comparison group counterparts. So far, we have only had a chance to follow CCC alumni for one year. A longer-term look will be necessary to capture the full effects of participation on their employment experience. We hope to be able to take that look.

Third, our feeling about youth corps programs is that enrolling corpsmembers from all parts of society benefits youth by exposing them to a variety of individuals with whom they must learn to work cooperatively. However, the feeling remains just that. We have, so far, been unable to document the impact on youth of an untargeted enrollment policy. What we have found, however, is that in such a mixed population of corpsmembers, length of service does not appear to be influenced by a corpsmember's age, sex, ethnicity, age or income status.

Irrespective of that issue, however, we remain convinced that a mixed enrollment is beneficial to the program by inspiring support from a broad constituency. Unfortunately, programs that restrict services to the disadvantaged often get labelled by the public and potential participants as programs for losers--and everybody suffers. It is crucial that a national youth corps program avoid such a label.

Our research is also relevant to some implementation issues that will no doubt be dealt with in the regulations, but which I would like to mention here:

- Providing a mix of residential and non-residential centers in both urban and rural parts of a state would be ideal as a way of attracting a mix of enrollees. A non-residential center in a rural area, for example, will not attract urban youth. Residential centers are less attractive to young people with family responsibilities.

- Planning and delivery of educational services has been a great challenge to existing corps. If the emphasis is on getting work done expeditiously, taking time off to go to school is counterproductive. At the same time, making classes voluntary and offering them at the end of a day of hard physical work is unlikely to engage the attention of youth already alienated from school. And packaged offerings, not specially designed to serve such youth, are unlikely to meet their needs. As with the effort to attract enrollment by a wide range of youth, planning for education will require special attention from state programs.

- Implicit in the discussion of corps goals, beyond accomplishing work and increasing employability, a third goal--developing a sense of service--is espoused by many of the advocates of such programs. Our experience has shown that participants will not acquire a "sense of service to society" simply by virtue of the fact that they are working on public lands or facilities. Most youth who work in corps programs view it as a job and little else. If the purpose of a national corps is to develop a sense of service, it must be consciously cultivated by corps staff and crew leaders. Otherwise, corpsmembers are unlikely to make the connection between their daily work and contributing to the good of society.

Clearly, the youth conservation and service corps field is still full of unanswered questions--as well as great potential. We have only recently begun to try answering them. We need to know much more about how the targeting issue relates to youth's experience in the corps, whether or not they benefit economically and otherwise after they finish their service, the relative effectiveness of a residential or non-residential experience for different enrollee groups, the potential of corps to deliver human services, the different modes of attracting a heterogenous population and of providing educational services, improved work valuation and cost-benefit methodologies. These things can only be learned through additional experience, as the committee well recognized when it included a provision for funding demonstration projects.

In sum, the proposed ACC legislation addresses, in a useful way, two important unmet needs of this nation: the need to improve and protect our public lands and the need to increase employment opportunities for our youth--both in the corps and after.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Bailin. I think your last point, on regulations, is something that many times we overlook after we've passed the legislation, even though there is the opportunity for us to input. I think that we need to follow up on that, to make sure that the regulations are written in such a way that the agency responsible for discharging the law doesn't take a hands-off approach like they did initially in the JTPA program, where locals were left wondering if they were doing the right thing.

Let me say that all of your testimonies have been enlightening and you have brought out some good points, and you have answered some of the questions that I initially had intended to ask.

One of the questions that I was going to ask all the panel was, concerned replies for those opponents who say, "well, if the States are doing it why should the Federal Government get into it?" I think, Mr. Basl, you made an excellent point in saying that this would stimulate programs being initiated where they are not now. This would provide a vehicle for States who maybe could not do it on their own, and, realizing that it is a matching program, they might come up with the monies—whatever limited monies they have—to be able to get into the program.

But let me go ahead and ask a question that might provide us with some good argument from your own personal experiences. What do we say when people say, "If the States are already doing it, why should the Federal Government get into it?" Mr. Tindall?

Mr. TINDALL. I think the evidence is that most of the states aren't doing it. We tend to refer to the states as being all of equal economic capacity and employment statistics, and all looking like twins or triplets, or whatever 50 of them might be. In fact, that's not the case. We have many differences, many opportunities. And there's a great deal to be said for—it's not exactly peer pressure, but a lot of State capitols are looking across the river or across the state boundary to what the other state capitol is doing. We've seen the present state corps or local programs that we have, the first ones were really out on the leading edge of this marriage, as Raul and others talked about, of environment and conservation and employment and education types of things. It's taken three, four, seven, eight years even to get to the point where we are right now. There are so many—there is so much to be done in terms of projects and so much service to be rendered for the populations involved that we've got to accelerate that. That's why we need this program. We're talking three years, as I mentioned at the outset; not a 30-year program. Three years to accelerate the information sharing, the experience sharing, to get more "demonstration" stuff out there, to learn some things through good activity and learn some things by must messing up a lot of programs, which we will do. And like I say, we ought to learn from those rather than, as other programs do, say, "Hey, we're not going to deal with at-risk kids or youth because they're going to fail." Yes, many of them will fail; but as others have said, it's less expensive to try than it is to deal with the long-term social problems that might end up in incarceration or something else.

Mr. MARTINEZ. There's a TV program that says, "Good answer. Good answer." And that's a good answer.

Ms. LENNON. I just wanted to point out, Mr. Chairman, that in your own district, the Los Angeles Conservation Corps started because there was legislation at the state that allowed for creation of new programs. And when we lobbied that legislation through, there were only two local conservation corps. This year alone, when they just went through the request for proposal process, we're starting 10 new programs. The LA Conservation Corps started completely with money from that legislation.

So I think the answer, that money leverages other money, and that you can mix and match, has really encouraged a lot of programs to start. Without the Garamendi legislation in the State of California there would still be one State program and two local rather than something like 12 programs that are now in operation over the last year and a half.

So I think it's a real good point that the encouragement given, whether it's on the Federal level or the state level or the local level, can really serve in a powerful way to leverage other funds.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Yzaguirre?

Mr. YZAGUIRRE. I would just like to underscore what my colleagues have said. There's a sense of legitimizing a program when you have Federal legislation that's terribly important. It says, we've looked at it and we think it's an effective way, and that can stimulate state activity and local activity, and we ought not underestimate the power of that. And as has been indicated before, what we're doing through this legislation is trying to learn more.

The Federal Government does a lot of things right and a lot of things wrong, but one of the things that it does right is that it can help across state lines in making sure that what works in one area can get duplicated, and what didn't work in one area is avoided somewhere else. And that demonstration and that information dissemination role, which is part of this legislation, I think is also a very powerful rationale for supporting it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Basl?

Mr. BASL. Mr. Chairman, I think that the matching requirement in the legislation, as I mentioned before, is vitally important. I think it's important that people put up a good faith effort locally, that they really want this legislation and they want the money and the responsibility that goes along with it.

I think also that there's a kind of a multiplier effect, if you will, to look at. I think Federal money can help leverage state money; state money can help leverage local money. Local money may help leverage private or foundation money or corporate money. That's not to say that it happens in that sequence, but I think when you have a true partnership where everyone is involved, I think that strengthens the program. Everyone has a stake in it being run well and administered properly, so I think there's a proper role for the Federal Government, the state government, the local government, private corporations, local private nonprofit organizations—a true partnership. And I think that the one piece that we're missing right now that can stimulate all of us, that can cement this into a true partnership, is the Federal involvement.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Bailin?

Mr. BAILIN. I would just add that we probably ought to keep in mind how fragile and small this fledgling, growing movement still is. The fact of the matter is, if there's $100 million being spent on year-round programs now from all the states, and you consider that half of that is being spent by the State of California, and you consider that there are 10,000 kids, approximately, in year-round programs being served by that—yes, it's growing, and it's starting in a lot of places, but the resources are not now there to really stimulate these things in a way where they can have an impact. So as we talk about this I think it's well to keep in mind that it's still a very fragile growth and movement, and support of the balanced sort suggested by this legislation is exactly what I think is needed.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Ms. Fremstad?

Ms. FREMSTAD. I know after I moved back to Wisconsin from Virginia, I wondered just how many states did have a conservation corps. I can't answer your question exactly as to why the Federal Government should get involved. I just know that if I were a person from another state, I would feel awfully neglected if we did not have a conservation corps. I've seen the work we've done in Trempealeau County and I know that Trempealeau County appreciates us, and every other county in Wisconsin that has a corps.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Very good.

Let me make a couple of announcements, and then I want to get on the record, if I can, if there are some young people who are conservation corps members who would like to just say a word about where they would be if they were not in the conservation corps and how they feel it has affected them positively.

Before I do that, I would like to say that I'm going to leave the record open so that Mr. Gunderson, who had to leave and who has some questions for this panel, that he might submit those in writing and you might respond, and they might be entered into the record also.

Mr. MARTINEZ. With that, I'd like to ask if any of you young conservation corps people here might like to say a word about where you would have been if you were not in this program, and how it has changed your outlook or thinking?

Stand up and identify yourself, please, for the record.

Mr. WILKIE. I am Jeffree Wilkie from the Silver Spring area. I've only been here a short time, but right now I'd probably just be in jail or somewhere—I'm kind of nervous here, but anyway——

Mr. MARTINEZ. We're all nervous, too.

Mr. WILKIE. It has a lot of long-term goals for me right now, as in getting a certificate saying that I'll be going on training as a carpenter, so that maybe in three to five years from now, or six months, or however long it takes me to get it, because I do have a little learning disability in reading measurements of tape—they are slowly but surely telling me how to read one, and hopefully I will be able to read one, which I think positively and definitely I should be able to read one.

But I think right now, the longer I'm going to be there, it's going to help me in the long term, so I have a positive, long-term goal.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Anyone else?

Mr. EGAN. My name is Brendan Egan. If I wasn't in the corps—I'm a high school dropout. I've been into drugs and crime and all that. If I wasn't in the corps right now I'd probably be out doing those things, crime, drugs and so forth. Plus, I'm learning carpentry. I'm getting my GED, which is the high school equivalency diploma, and it's just really good for me. I don't make a lot of money, but I also have a good time. It's basically what I want to do, and it's getting me started in a career instead of crime; maybe not a businessman, but a laborer, where I could just support a family or something.

Mr. MARTINEZ. You'd be surprised. A lot of people started as laborers first and then go into business.

Mr. EGAN. Well, yes, I know.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I started as an upholsterer and I'm here in Congress now. [Laughter.]

Mr. EGAN. Well, okay. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. I'm just saying, never set a limit for yourself. Go for it as far as you can.

Mr. EGAN. Well, anyway, I think it's really good and I think that this thing should pass.

Mr. MARTINEZ. You know it's been good for you, right?

Mr. EGAN. Yes. It's good for me. And if I wasn't here, I'd be, like I said, out partying and doing stuff. So I just wanted to say that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Anybody else?

Ms. MEYER. I'm Marty Meyer, and I'm Executive Director of Education for Charter Hospital for Emotionally Disturbed Children. And I agree with virtually everything this panel has said. I deal with young people like you at times, and I'm glad to see that I don't have to design education programs for you.

My main concern is that when you do begin with at risk children, I think it is important to think of it in terms of education and to incorporate the special educators that we have trained out there in designing some of these programs, because I think it can be a real plus and we can help a great deal more children that way.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Marty.

I'd just like to say in closing—I'd like to get a couple of those T-shirts. I'm a T-shirt collector. [Laughter.]

But I want to thank you all for coming here. This is a very important piece of legislation. John Sieberling worked very hard on it while he was here, and it looked like, at one point in time, he was going to have success. Tragically—and I say tragically—he didn't, but those of us who are proponents of The American Conservation Corps are going to work like the devil to see that this time we get it through. I think we have the kind of support we need in the Congress; now we've got to get the kind of support we need from the Administration.

And with that, I ask you all to tell your friends and relatives and neighbors and everyone you can to write letters to the White House and tell them that we need this now.

Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. We are adjourned.

[A copy of H.R. 18 and additional material submitted for the record follows:]

[Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

100TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 18

To establish the American Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 6, 1987

Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. KILDEE) introduced the following bill; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To establish the American Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Conservation Corps Act of 1987".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) conserving or developing natural and cultural resources and enhancing and maintaining environmentally important lands and waters through the use of the

Nation's young men and women is beneficial not only to the youth of the Nation by providing them with education and work opportunities but also for the Nation's economy and its environment; and

(2) through this work experience opportunity, the Nation's youth will further their understanding and appreciation of the natural and cultural resources in addition to learning basic and fundamental work ethics including discipline, cooperation, understanding to live and work with others, and learning the value of a day's work for a day's wages.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1)(A) enhance and maintain conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement work on public lands and Indian lands,

(B) improve and restore public lands and Indian lands, resources, and facilities,

(C) conserve energy, and

(D) restore and maintain community lands, resources, and facilities;

(2) establish an American Conservation Corps to carry out a program to improve, restore, maintain, and conserve these lands and resources in the most cost-effective manner;

(3) assist State and local governments and Indian tribes in carrying out needed public land and resource conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement projects;

(4) provide for implementation of the program in such manner as will foster conservation and the wise use of natural and cultural resources through the establishment of working relationships among the Federal, State, and local governments, Indian tribes, and other public and private organizations; and

(5) increase (by training and other means) employment opportunities for young men and women including, but not limited to, those who are economically, socially, physically, or educationally disadvantaged and who may not otherwise be productively employed.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "public lands" means any lands or waters (or interest therein) owned or administered by the United States or by any agency or instrumentality of a State or local government.

(2) The term "program" means all activities carried out under the American Conservation Corps established by this Act.

(3) The term "program agency" means any agency designated by the Governor to manage the pro-

gram in that State, and the governing body of any Indian tribe.

(4) The term "Indian tribe" means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other group which is recognized as an Indian tribe by the Secretary of the Interior. Such term also includes any Native village corporation, regional corporation, and Native group established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(5) The term "Indian" means a person who is a member of an Indian tribe.

(6) The term "Indian lands" means any real property owned by an Indian tribe, any real property held in trust by the United States for Indian tribes, and any real property held by Indian tribes which is subject to restrictions on alienation imposed by the United States.

(7) The term "employment security service" means the agency in each of the several States with responsibility for the administration of unemployment and employment programs, and the oversight of local labor conditions.

(8) The term "chief administrator" means the head of any program agency as that term is defined in paragraph (3).

(9) The term "enrollee" means any individual enrolled in the American Conservation Corps in accordance with section 5.

(10) The term "crew leader" means an enrollee appointed under authority of this Act for the purpose of supervising other enrollees engaged in work projects pursuant to this Act.

(11) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(12) The term "economically disadvantaged" with respect to youths has the same meaning given such term in section 4(8) of the Job Training Partnership Act.

SEC. 4. AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS.—There is hereby established an American Conservation Corps.

(b) REGULATIONS AND ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall jointly promulgate the regulations necessary to implement the American Conservation

Corps established by this Act. Within 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish procedures to give program agencies and other interested parties, including the public, adequate notice and opportunity to comment upon and participate in the formulation of such regulations. The regulations shall include provisions to assure uniform reporting on the activities and accomplishments of American Conservation Corps programs, demographic characteristics of enrollees in the American Conservation Corps, and such other information as may be necessary to prepare the annual report under section 10.

(c) PROJECTS INCLUDED.—The American Conservation Corps established under this section may carry out such projects as—

(1) conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement of wildlife habitat, rangelands, parks, and recreational areas;

(2) urban revitalization and historical and cultural site preservation;

(3) fish culture and habitat maintenance and improvement and other fishery assistance;

(4) road and trail maintenance and improvement;

(5)(A) erosion, flood, drought, and storm damage assistance and controls,

(B) stream, lake, and waterfront harbor and port improvement, and

(C) wetlands protection and pollution control;

(6) insect, disease, rodent, and fire prevention and control;

(7) improvement of abandoned railroad bed and right-of-way;

(8) energy conservation projects, renewable resource enhancement, and recovery of biomass;

(9) reclamation and improvement of strip-mined land; and

(10) forestry, nursery, and silvicultural operations.

(d) PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—The program shall provide a preference for those projects which—

(1) will provide long-term benefits to the public;

(2) will instill in the enrollee involved a work ethic and a sense of public service;

(3) will be labor intensive; and

(4) can be planned and initiated promptly.

(e) LIMITATION TO PUBLIC LANDS.—Projects to be carried out by the American Conservation Corps shall be limited to projects on public lands or Indian lands except where a project involving other lands will provide a documented public benefit as determined by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture. The regulations promulgated

under subsection (b) shall establish the criteria necessary to make such determinations.

(f) CONSISTENCY.—All projects carried out under this Act for conservation, rehabilitation, or improvement of any public lands or Indian lands shall be consistent with the provisions of law and policies relating to the management and administration of such lands, with all other applicable provisions of law, and with all management, operational, and other plans and documents which govern the administration of the area.

(g) APPLICATION PROCEDURES.—(1) Each program agency may apply for approval to participation in the American Conservation Corps under this Act.

(2) Application for participation in the American Conservation Corps on Federal public lands shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture in such manner as is provided for by the regulations promulgated under subsection (b). Applications for participation in the American Conservation Corps on non-Federal public lands or Indian land shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior. Application for participation in the the American Conservation Corps on projects on lands described in subsection (e) shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior as the case may be. No application may be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior

or the Secretary of Agriculture before the 30-day period for review and comment by the appropriate State Job Training Coordinating Council (established under the Job Training Partnership Act), if any, which shall consult with the appropriate Private Industry Council, or Councils, in the area in which a project is carried out. Comments of the State Job Training Coordinating Council and Private Industry Council shall be forwarded to the Secretary at the time the grant application is submitted.

(3) Each application under this section must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, and shall contain—

(A) a comprehensive description of the objectives and performance goals for the program, a plan for managing and funding the program, and a description of the types of projects to be carried out, including a description of the types and duration of training and work experience to be provided;

(B) a plan to make arrangements for certification of the training skills acquired by enrollers and award of academic credit to enrollees for competencies developed from training programs or work experience obtained under this Act;

(C) an estimate of the number of enrollees and crew leaders necessary for the proposed projects, the

lenght of time for which the services of such personnel will be required, and the services which will be required for their support;

(D) a description of the location and types of facilities and equipment to be used in carrying out the programs; and

(E) such other information as the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe.

(4) In approving the location and type of any facility to be used in carrying out the program, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall give the consideration to—

(A) the proximity of any such facility to the work to be done;

(B) the cost and means of transportation available between any such facility and the homes of the enrollees who may be assigned to that facility;

(C) the participation of economically, socially, physically, or educationally disadvantaged youths

(D) the cost of establishing, maintaining, and staffing the facility.

Every effort shall be made to assign youths to facilities as near to their homes as practicable.

(5)(A) Every program shall have sufficient supervisory staff appointed by the chief administrator which may include enrollees who have displayed exceptional leadership qualities.

(B) No project shall be undertaken without the on-site presence of knowledgeable and competent supervision, and all projects undertaken shall be documented in advance in an approved written project plan.

(h) LOCAL PARTICIPATION.—Any State carrying out a program under this Act shall provide a mechanism under which local governments and nonprofit organizations within the State may be approved by the State to participate in the American Conservation Corps.

(i) AGREEMENTS.—Program agencies may enter into contracts and other appropriate arrangements with local government agencies and nonprofit organizations for the operation or management of any projects or facilities under the program.

(j) JOINT PROJECTS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized to develop jointly with the Secretary of Labor regulations designed to allow, where appropriate, joint projects in which activities supported by funds authorized under this Act are coordinated with activities supported by funds authorized under employment and

training statutes administered by the Department of Labor (including the Job Training Partnership Act). Such regulations shall provide standards for approval of joint projects which meet both the purposes of this Act and the purposes of such employment and training statutes under which funds are available to support the activities proposed for approval. Such regulations shall also establish a single mechanism for approval of joint projects developed at the State or local level.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and program agencies may enter into agreements, jointly or separately, with the Secretary of Defense to assist the military by carrying out projects under this Act. Such projects may be carried out on a reimbursable basis or otherwise.

SEC. 5. ENROLLMENT, FUNDING, AND MANAGEMENT.

(a) ENROLLMENT IN PROGRAM.—(1)(A) Enrollment in the American Conservation Corps shall be limited to individuals who, at the time of enrollment, are—

(i) unemployed;

(ii) not less than 16 years or more than 25 years of age (except that programs limited to the months of June, July, and August may include individuals not

less than 15 years and not more than 21 years of age at the time of their enrollment); and

(iii) citizens or nationals of the United States (including those citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands as defined in Public Law 98–213 (97 Stat. 1459)) or lawful permanent residents of the United States.

(B) Special efforts shall be made to recruit and enroll individuals who, at the time of enrollment, are economically disadvantaged.

(C) In addition to recruitment enrollment efforts required in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make special efforts to recruit enrollees who are socially, physically, and educationally disadvantaged youths.

(D) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a limited number of special corps members may be enrolled without regard to their age so that the corps may draw upon their special skills which may contribute to the attainment of their purposes of the Act.

(2) Except in the case of a program limited to the months of June, July, and August, individuals who at the time of applying for enrollment have attained 16 years of age but not attained 19 years of age, and who are no longer enrolled in any secondary school shall not be enrolled unless they give adequate written assurances, under criteria to be

established by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, that they did not leave school for the express purpose of enrolling. The regulations promulgated under section 4(b) shall provide such criteria.

(3) The selection of enrollees to serve in the American Conservation Corps shall be the responsibility of the chief administrator of the program agency. Enrollees shall be selected from those qualfied persons who have applied to, or been recruited by, the program agency, a State employment security service, a local school district with an employment referral service, an administrative entity under the Job Training Partnership Act, a community or community-based nonprofit organization, the sponsor of an Indian program, or the sponsor of a migrant or seasonal farmworker program.

(4)(A) Except for a program limited to the months of June, July, and August, any qualified individual selected for enrollment may be enrolled for a period not to exceed 24 months. When the term of enrollment does not consist of one continuous 24-month term, the total of shorter terms may not exceed 24 months.

(B) No individual may remain enrolled in the American Conservation Corps after that individual has attained the age of 26 years, except as provided in subsection (a)(1)(D) of this section.

(5) Within the American Conservation Corps the directors of programs shall establish and stringently enforce standards of conduct to promote proper moral and disciplinary conditions. Enrollees who violate these standards shall be transferred to other locations, or dismissed, if it is determined that their retention in that particular program, or in the Corps, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards or diminish the opportunities of other enrollees. Such disciplinary measures will be subject to expeditious appeal to the appropriate Secretary.

(b) SERVICES, FACILITIES, SUPPLIES.—The program agency shall provide facilities, quarters, and board (in the case of residential facilities), limited and emergency medical care, transportation from administrative facilities to work sites, and other appropriate services, supplies, and equipment. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may provide services, facilities, supplies, and equipment to any program agency carrying out projects under this Act. Whenever possible, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make arrangements with the Secretary of Defense to have logistical support provided by a military installation near the work site, including the provision of temporary tent centers where needed, and other supplies and equipment. Basic standards of work requirements,

health, nutrition, sanitation, and safety for all projects shall be established and enforced.

(c) REQUIREMENT OF PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN SERVICES.—Enrollees shall be required to pay a reasonable portion of the cost of room and board provided at residential facilities into rollover funds administered by the appropriate program agency. Such payments and rates are to be established after evaluation of costs of providing the services. The rollover funds established pursuant to this section shall be used solely to defray the costs of room and board for enrollees. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense are authorized to make available to program agencies surplus food and equipment as may be available from Federal programs.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL AND STATE EMPLOYEE STATUS.

Enrollees, crew leaders, and volunteers are deemed as being responsible to, or the responsibility of, the program agency administering the project on which they work. Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs, enrollees and crew leaders in projects for which funds have been authorized pursuant to section 13 shall not be deemed Federal employees and should not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment:

(1) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the compensa-

tion of Federal employees for work injuries, enrollees and crew leaders serving American Conservation Corps program agencies shall be deemed employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provision of that subchapter shall apply, except—

(A) the term "performance of duty" shall not include any act of an enrollee or crew leader while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction and supervision of a program agency (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty); and

(B) compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee's or crew leader's employment is terminated.

(2) For purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims procedure, enrollees and crew leaders on American Conservation Corps projects shall be deemed employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employ-

ee of the Government" as defined in section 2671 of title 28, United States Code.

(3) For purposes of section 5911 of title 5, United States Code, relating to allowances for quarters, enrollees and crew leaders shall be deemed employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in that section.

SEC. 7. USE OF VOLUNTEERS

Where any program agency has authority to use volunteer services in carrying out functions of the agency, such agency may use volunteer services for purposes of assisting projects carried out under this Act and may expend funds made available for those purposes to the agency, including funds made available under this Act, to provide for services or costs incidental to the utilization of such volunteers, including transportation, supplies, lodging, subsistence, recruiting, training, and supervision. The use of volunteer services permitted by this section shall be subject to the condition that such use does not result in the displacement of any enrollee.

SEC. 8. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY.

The Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority may accept the services of volunteers and provide for their incidental expenses to carry out any activity of the Tennessee Valley Authority except policy-making or law or regulatory enforcement. Such volunteers shall not be deemed

employees of the United States Government except for the purposes of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and shall not be deemed employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority except for the purposes of tort claims of the same extent as a regular employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority would be under indentical circumstances.

SEC. 9. SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) PAY.—(1) The rate of pay for enrollees shall be the equivalent of 95 percent of the pay rate for members of the Armed Forces in the enlisted grade E–1 who have served for four months or more on active duty, from which a reasonable charge for enrollee room and board shall be deducted by the program agency.

(2) Enrollees shall receive $50 cash incentive stipends for every three months of enrollment in the program.

(3) The rate of pay for crew leaders shall be at a wage comparable to the compensation in effect for grades GS–3 to GS–7.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and the chief administrator of program agencies carrying out programs under this Act shall coordinate the programs with related Federal, State, local, and private activities.

(c) CERTIFICATION AND ACADEMIC CREDIT.—Pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (B) and (C) of section 4(g)(3), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide guidance and assistance to program agencies in securing certification of training skills or academic credit for competencies developed under this Act.

(d) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall provide for research and evaluation to—

(1) determine costs and benefits, tangible and otherwise, of work performed under this Act and of training and employable skills and other benefits gained by enrollees, and

(2) identify options for improving program productivity and youth benefits, which may include alternatives for—

(A) organization, subjects, sponsorship, and funding of work projects;

(B) recruitment and personnel policies;

(C) siting and functions of facilities;

(D) work and training regimes for youth of various origins and needs; and

(E) cooperative arrangements with programs, persons, and institutions not covered under this Act.

(e) CCC SITES.—The Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall study sites at which Civilian Conservation Corps activities were undertaken for purposes of determining a suitable location and means to commemorate the Civilian Conservation Corps. Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit a report to the Congress containing the results of the study carried out under this section. The report shall include cost estimates and recommendations for any legislative action.

(f) STUDY.—(1) Program agencies shall not use more than 10 percent of the funds available to them to provide training and educational materials and services for enrollees and may enter into arrangements with academic institutions or education providers, including local education agencies, community colleges, four-year colleges, area vocational-technical schools and community based organizations, for academic study by enrollees during nonworking hours to upgrade literacy skills, obtain a high school diploma or its equivalency, or college degrees, or enhance employable skills. Enrollees who have not obtained a high school diploma or its equivalency shall have priority to receive services under this subsection. Whenever possible, an enrollee seeking study or training not provided at his or her assigned facility shall be

offered assignment to a facility providing such study or training.

(2) Standards and procedures with respect to the awarding of academic credit and certifying educational attainment in programs conducted under paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the requirement of applicable State and local law and regulations.

(g) GUIDANCE AND PLACEMENT.—Program agencies shall provide such job guidance and placement information and assistance for enrollees as may be necessary. Such assistance shall be provided in coordination with appropriate State, local, and private agencies and organizations.

SEC. 10. ANNUAL REPORT.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress at least once each year a report detailing the activities carried out under this Act in the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall be submitted not later than December 31 of each year following the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. LABOR MARKET INFORMATION.

The Secretary of Labor shall make available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to any program agency under this Act such labor market information as is appropriate for use in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 12. EMPLOYEE APPEAL RIGHTS.

(a) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—In the case of—

(1) the displacement of a Federal employee (including any partial displacement through reduction of nonovertime hours, wages, or employment benefits) or the failure to reemploy an employee in a layoff status, contrary to a certification under section 13(c) (1) or (2), or

(2) the displacement of such a Federal employee by reason of the use of one or more volunteers under section 7 of this Act,

such employee is entitled to appeal such action to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) OTHER INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of—

(1) the displacement of any other individual employed (either directly or under contract with any private contractor) by a program agency or grantee, or the failure to reemploy an employee in layoff status, contrary to a certification under section 13(c) (1) or (2), or

(2) the displacement of such individual by reason of the use of one or more volunteers under section 7 of this Act,

the requirements contained in section 144 of the Job Training Partnership Act (Public Law 97-300) shall apply, and

such individual shall be deemed an interested person for purposes of the application of such requirements.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "displacement" includes, but is not limited to, any partial displacement through reduction of nonovertime hours, wages, or employment benefits.

SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—Of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (g) to carry out this Act for any fiscal year—

(1) not less than 50 percent shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure by State program agencies which have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior for participation in the American Conservation Corps;

(2) not less than 15 percent shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for expenditure by agencies within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the provisions of subsection (e);

(3) not less than 5 percent shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture, under such terms as are provided for in regulations promulgated under section 4(b), for expenditure by other Federal agencies;

(4) not less than 25 percent shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure by

agencies within the Department of the Interior, subject to the provisions of subsection (e), and for demonstration projects or projects of special merit carried out by any program agency or by any nonprofit organization or local government which is undertaking or proposing to undertake projects consistent with the purposes of this Act;

(5) not less than 5 percent shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure by the governing bodies of participating Indian tribes.

(b) AWARD OF GRANTS.—Within 60 days after enactment of appropriations legislation pursuant to subsection (g), any program agency may apply to the Secretary of the Interior for funds under this Act. In determining the allocation of funds among the program agencies, the Secretary shall consider each of the following factors:

(1) The proportion of the unemployed youth population of the State.

(2) The conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement needs on public lands within the State.

(3) The amount of other support for the program and the extent to which the size and effectiveness of a program will be enhanced by the use of the Federal funds.

Any State receiving funds for the operation of any program under this Act shall be required to provide not less than 50 percent of the cost of such program.

(c) NON-DISPLACEMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall not fund any program or enter into any agreement with any program agency for the funding of any program under this Act unless the Secretary concerned or such agency certifies that projects carried out by the program will not—

(1) result in the displacement of individuals currently employed (either directly or under contract with any private contractor) by the program agency concerned (including partial displacement through reduction of nonovertime hours, wages, or employment benefits);

(2) result in the employment of any individual when any other person is in a layoff status from the same or substantially equivalent job within the jurisdiction of the program agency concerned;

(3) impair existing contracts for services; or

(4) result in the inability of persons who normally contract with the agency for carrying out projects involving forestry, nursery, or silvicultural operations on commercial forest land to continue to obtain contracts to carry out such projects.

For purposes of paragraph (4), the term "commercial forest land" means land in the National Forest System or land administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management which is producing, or is capable of producing, 50 cubic feet per acre per year of industrial wood and which is not withdrawn from timber utilization by statute or administrative decision.

(d) STATE SHARE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—If, at the commencement of any fiscal year, any State does not have a program agency designated by the Governor to manage the program in that State, then during such fiscal year any local government within such State may establish a program agency to carry out the program within the political subdivision which is under the jurisdiction of such local government. Such local government program agency shall be in all respects subject to the same requirements as a State program agency. Where more than one local government within a State has established a program agency under this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall allocate funds between such agencies in such manner as he deems equitable.

(e) PROGRAMS ON FEDERAL LANDS.—Funds provided under this section to any Federal agency shall be used to carry out projects on Federal lands and to provide for the Federal administrative costs of implementing this Act. In utilizing such funds, the Federal agencies may enter into con-

tracts or other agreements with program agencies and with local governments and nonprofit organizations approved under section 4(h).

(f) PAYMENT TERMS.—Payments under grants under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and at such intervals and on such conditions as the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate, finds necessary.

(g) USE OF FUNDS.—Contract authority under this Act shall be subject to the availability of appropriations. Funds provided under this Act shall only be used for activities which are in addition to those which would otherwise be carried out in the area in the absence of such funds. Not more than 10 percent of the funds made available to any program agency for projects during each fiscal year may be used for the purchase of major capital equipment.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The regulations under section 4(b) shall establish appropriate limitations on the administrative expenses of Federal agencies and program agencies carrying out programs under this Act. Such limitations shall insure that administrative expenses of such programs shall be minimized to the extent practicable taking into consideration the purposes of this Act and the nature of the programs carried out under this Act.

(i) APPROPRIATION LEVELS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this Act $75,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1988 through 1990. Funds appropriated under this Act shall remain available until expended.

○

STATEMENT ON H.R. 18, THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT, FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

LEON E. PANETTA
16th Congressional District, California

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to the Chairman and the entire subcommittee for the opportunity to submit a statement for this hearing on H.R. 18, the American Conservation Corps Act. I feel that this legislation represents an important investment in the land and young people of this country.

Our generation today enjoys the benefits from a similar investment made during the Great Depression through the Civilian Conservation Corps. We need look only as far as the nearby magnificent Skyline Drive of Virginia's Shenandoahs to behold the benefits of the CCC. Much conservation work in our nation's parks, forests, and public lands continues to go neglected. In my own district along the Big Sur coast of California, much conservation work remains to be done. Erosion control along coastal roads and trails, forestry management, fishery improvements, fire prevention efforts, and essential park improvements are all needed.

This bill makes an investment not only in these needed conservation efforts but in the future of our country as represented by our nation's young people. The Conservation Corps funded through this program will bring together young people of varying backgrounds in a common effort to better themselves and their environment. While this bill is in no way a panacea for the national tragedy of youth unemployment, it takes an important step in the right direction by

providing greater opportunities for our youth to serve.

I believe it is also significant, and encouraging, that this measure provides greater funding to state and local conservation corps efforts. It is indeed heartening that over 40 state and local youth conservation corps have sprung into existence over the last several years. These localities have recognized an important need in their communities and have devised innovative programs to meet them with scarce resources. Yet even with this commitment, these programs are severely underfunded and have not achieved their full potential. These programs serve national needs and I believe deserve national help.

In this connection, I believe that the American Conservation Corps should be one important piece of a much larger program of voluntary national youth service. Toward this end, I have, as you know, introduced legislation, H.R. 460, the Voluntary National Youth Service Act, that would provide assistance to state and local service corps providing community services ranging from care for the elderly to day care for our preschool children to weatherization of low-income homes to literacy tutoring.

Both H.R. 18 and H.R. 460 reflect a growing interest across the nation in youth service. This is fueled by a number of factors, not the least of which is that such programs make economic sense. Today, we spend over $10 billion on job training, drug enforcement, unemployment compensation, and compensatory education to deal with unemployed youth. A modest federal program to encourage local and

state governments to provide service opportunities to our youth could greatly reduce spending in all of these areas.

In this time of budgetary restraint, there is a growing realization that government alone cannot fulfill all the unmet social needs of this country. Yet, while these many social needs go unfulilled, there exists a great reservoir of young people looking to make a constructive contribution to their society. You are no doubt aware of the youth unemployment problem. While total national unemployment hovers at approximately 7%, teen joblessness stands at 14% for whites, 26% for Hispanics, and 38% for blacks, and the more than 3.1 million jobless youth comprise almost 39% of all unemployed in this country. In addition, many of the jobs available to youth are low-paying, low-opportunity service-sector jobs.

Frankly, the cost of not doing something, and the lost opportunity for doing good for our youth and country, is tremendous. The above-cited cost of youth crime, prisons, and welfare dependency - and the wasted potential of these young people who could be constructively contributing to our society - far exceeds the cost of these youth service programs. A recent Justice Department study estimated that the costs of youth crime alone are more than $5 billion. More importantly, however, studies done on the cost-effectiveness of youth service programs have shown that for every dollar spent on these projects, at least $1.20 of direct benefits are produced in work performed and services provided by youth service participants.

Money spent on these youth service programs is an essential investment

not only in the future of our youth but, as I stated, in needed services to our local communities. Finally, I would call on President Reagan, under whose governorship the California Ecology Corps - the predecessor of the California Conservation Corps - was founded, to support this measure. The California Conservation Corps in the President's home state enjoys tremendous bipartisan support. I strongly believe that the American Conservation Corps merits his attention and support, and I urge him to sign this measure if it again reaches his desk. That will happen if a majority of my colleagues in the House and Senate support the American Conservation Corps Act, as they did in the 99th Congress. This bill, and a larger voluntary national youth service program, deserve the full support of Congress.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN TO THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

May 21, 1987

Mr Chairman,

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee on legislation to create an American Conservation Corps. This bill has some widespread support in the Congress in this session as well as the just-ended one, and has attracted widespread editorial support as well. For example, in the last Congress, H.R. 4861, a similar bill, cosponsored by Congressmen Sieberling, Moffet, Roybal, Conte, and Bereuter, among others, passed the House on June 9, 1986 by a vote of 291-102.

The situation we address is indeed dire. In my own state of New York, 90,000 youths aged 16 to 19 were unemployed in the first six months of 1986 -- more than 20% of New York's teenagers.

And we are faced with a formidable and ever-increasing backlog of desperately-needed conservation work on federal, state, and local lands. Natural and community resources across the nation are deteriorating while millions of able-bodied Americans sit idle, victims of growing unemployment -- especially our youth. This waste of our human and natural resources cannot continue. Which brings us to today.

The idea of putting unemployed youth, those most susceptible to drug abuse, to work preserving our natural heritage is not new. Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps employed over three million young men during its nine year lifetime and performed $1.5 billion worth of conservation work. The CCC constructed over 150,000 miles of trails and roads, stretched over 85,000 miles of telephone lines, and built approximately 45,000 bridges. Much of its work still serves us today, eloquent testimony to the profound impact the CCC had on this nation's infrastructure and physical appearance.

More recently, the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC) and the Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) were cost-effective programs that returned over $1 in appraised conservation work for each dollar expended. I would add that in 1980 the New York YACC returned $2.83 in conservation work for each dollar expended. These figures, of course, cannot and do not include the benefits realized by putting previously unemployed young people to work. I suppose it is impossible to quantify the value of such benefits, but I would suggest that any program that is not only cost-effective but may also reduce youth crime and drug abuse and instill a work ethic in heretofore unemployed young people is a program that we cannot afford to be without.

Let me briefly explain legislation I introduced in the Senate on January 6, 1987 -- the first day of the 100th Congress -- S. 27, the American Conservation Corps act of 1987. This is the fourth time in six years I have introduced such a bill --

and I will continue to do so until we succeed in passing it. It will create an American Conservation Corps, composed of unemployed young men and women between the ages of 16 and 25 (there will also be a summer program for those 15 - 21) to carry out conservation and rehabilitation projects on public lands. Enrollees will be paid the minimum wage.

I applaud your efforts, Mr. Chairman, to give this proposal a fair hearing, and I hope we can succeed this year in an effort that has come so close so many times in the recent past -- all the way to a Presidential veto on one occasion.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, the track record of past youth conservation efforts strongly suggests that the American Conservation Corps will be successful. Successful at putting thousands of young people to work performing socially useful tasks and successful at preserving and rehabilitating our precious natural and community resources. I ask your help in securing passage of legislation to create an such a program. Our young people deserve no less.

MAY 27 1987

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

May 21, 1987

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Suzan Shown Harjo
Cheyenne & Creek Nations

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT
Reuben A. Snake Jr.
Winnebago Tribe

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT
John F. Gonzales
San Ildefonso Pueblo

RECORDING SECRETARY
Faith Martine
Klamath Tribe

TREASURER
Buford L. Rolin
Poarch Band of Creeks

AREA VICE PRESIDENTS

ABERDEEN AREA
John W. Sloans
Oglala Sioux Tribe

ALBUQUERQUE AREA
Marlies Pontiano
Pueblo de Acoma

ANADARKO AREA
Juanita Ahtone
Kiowa Tribe

BILLINGS AREA
Burnett Whitecalfe
Northern Arapahoe Tribe

JUNEAU AREA
Eric Morrison
Tlingit

MINNEAPOLIS AREA
Hillary Rouka
Menominee Tribe

MUSKOGEE AREA
Pamela Iron
Cherokee Nation

NORTHEASTERN AREA
Rosena Abrams
Seneca Nation

PHOENIX AREA
Thomas R. White
Gila River Indian Community

PORTLAND AREA
Allen V. Pinkham Sr.
Nez Perce Tribe

SACRAMENTO AREA
Dania Turner
Rincon Band of Luiseno

SOUTHEASTERN AREA
Billy Cypress
Miccosukee Tribe

Representative Matthew Martinez
Chairman
House of Education and Labor
Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities
Room 518 House Annex 1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman Martinez:

The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) submits this letter of support for H.R. 18, the American Conservation Corps Act of 1987, for inclusion in the hearing record. The National Congress of American Indians is the nation's oldest and largest membership organization serving the interests of American Indian and Alaska Native governments and individuals.

As you know, American Indians have the highest unemployment rate of any people in the country, with unemployment on some reservations as high as 80%. We desperately need legislation and other efforts which will provide jobs for Indian people.

Our experience with federal employment and other programs is that in order to be effective, they must have an Indian setaside of funds and an Indian delivery system. The legislation's setaside of 5% of funds for tribes and its emphasis on recruitment and enrollment of youth who are economically disadvantaged makes the bill particularly relevant for American Indians.

The jobs envisioned by the American Conservation Corps emphasize conservation of natural resources. This type of employment is well suited to the needs, both economic and cultural, in Indian country. Establishment of the American Conservation Corps would give opportunity and hope to thousands of American Indian and Alaska Native youth.

We urge swift passage of H.R. 18, the American Conservation Act of 1987.

Sincerely,

Suzan Shown Harjo

Suzan Shown Harjo
Executive Director

804 D STREET, N.E. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 • (202) 546-9404

FROM: California Conservation Corps
Santa Clara Center

TO: Honorable Matthew Martinez
House Committee on Education and Labor

MAY 21 1987

DATE: May 14, 1987

SUBJECT: National Conservation Corps

Dear Mr Martinez,

We, the undersigned corpsmembers of the Santa Clara Center, would like to express our support for the formation of a National Conservation Corps. We believe a unification would further our pursuit of bettering the environment now and for future generations. We urge you to vote for a National Conservation Corps program on May 21, 1987.

National Youth Leadership Council

Center for Youth Development & Research
University of Minnesota 386 McNeal Hall
St. Paul, MN 55108 (612) 624-3700

Notes on Social Criteria of Youth Service and Employment Programs (Draft for Discussion)

James C. Kielsmeier
University of Minnesota
February 3, 1987

-Programs for poor vs. people. Poor programs, and all too often, some v. poor programs. Constituency of programs affects significantly the quality and longevity of programs. Upper and middle class parents in public schools, for example, have long been associated with improvements in schools that include their children and those "at risk." A strong parental constituency in youth service and employment programs will insure higher quality and program persistence.

-Peer group influence on values is very significant for adolescents and young adults. Highly nurtured youth provide stimuli in areas of achievement, self-concept and career aspirations for "at risk" peers. well documented.

-Academic and pre-employment skills associated with these programs are often a function of group process. Youth teach and learn from each other and can be specifically encouraged to do so. This situation is much more likely to occur when there is effective social integration of the group. This is the concept of the one-room school house in a modern setting.

-Youth classified "at risk" soon discover when a program is targeted toward them. Lower expectations associated with programs exclusively for "at risk" youth are too easily assumed by program operators and by participants. Performance is affected significantly by expectation.

-Non-formal education settings such as a job or service project often stimulate positive achievements on the part of so-called "at risk" youth. The military has made this finding on a regular basis. The reverse is also true as traditional teachers sometimes have difficulty in a job or youth service project. A non-targeted setting provides a fresh start for youth who have experienced failure in other areas of their lives.